

THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva
by the World's Student Christian Federation

PHILIPPE MAURY, *Editor*

VOLUME XLVII

Second Quarter, 1954

NUMBER 2

Academic Freedom

For many years the World's Student Christian Federation has been concerned about what has been called "the university question". It has become constantly more obvious that the universities and colleges in which Student Christian Movements are at work are undergoing a very serious crisis. Everywhere they are facing the need for a general reconsideration of their structure, their curriculum, and their place in society, and much valuable material about such inquiries has been published in recent years in various parts of the world. It is not surprising that Student Christian Movements, sharing in this general feeling of uncertainty and frustration, are also trying to take their part in the effort to rethink the task of the university¹. But as Christians we are not only concerned with helping the university to remain true to its own principles. We are not even primarily interested in cooperating in making it a centre of the teaching and training which is indispensable to societies and nations undergoing rapid changes. We share in these common human concerns for responsibility, service and truth, but there is another sort of interest of which the Federation and its member Movements, as manifestations of the life of the Church in the university, have become more clearly aware during recent years. It can be summed up by saying that we are trying to grasp more clearly the implications for our general evangelistic responsibility of the fact that we are addressing ourselves to students — a particular sort of men and women,

¹ Reports on current activities of national groups in the Federation University Commission will be published in the next issue of *The Student World*.

living a life of study in a particular institution and community, the university. During these last twenty years much attention has been given to the way in which students' minds are shaped, whether they are aware of it or not, by the kind of teaching which they receive in their universities. It may be that this fact was brought forcibly to our attention by the growth of totalitarian forms of the university under fascist and communist regimes. But this thinking led to the conclusion that it would be completely erroneous to imagine that the danger lay only on the totalitarian side: a similar danger exists in our so-called liberal or free universities. One could almost say that in all universities there is at least a threat of totalitarianism, which is perhaps even more serious in cases where ideological pressure is brought to bear upon students in hidden ways. For instance, it has often been contended that in the universities of Western Europe and America the implicit belief in the absolute and ultimate power of reason practically amounts to imposing upon all university members an ideological creed which, though not political in character, can lead to the same totalitarian perversion as the great modern political totalitarianisms.

Asian contribution

For the last five years the participation of groups of Asian professors and students in this Federation university discussion has led to the initiation of a thorough investigation of the relationship between the university and society. In the newly-independent countries of Asia, universities are called to render more immediate and essential service to society, through the provision of new leadership in all areas of life, than is the case in the old countries of the West. The contrast is rather shocking between the uncertainty which prevails in Western universities and the atmosphere in those of Asia. In the West the question is being asked with increasing frequency both by members of the university and by those outside: are universities still the centres where culture, thought and social patterns are being shaped for the future? Have they not become rather technical institutions responsible for the transmission of out-moded cultural forms and for practical professional training? By contrast, it appears that the universities of Asia are at the

very heart of new efforts of thinking, and that they are the places *par excellence* where the future of societies is being studied and prepared. It is not surprising, therefore, that in the life of the Federation the Asian contribution has been mostly to bring into the discussion this new concern for Christian thinking about the university's responsibility to society. It is also significant that in Asia university professors have taken a proportionately greater interest in our general effort than in most Western countries.

Totalitarianism and witch hunting

In the past *The Student World* has frequently reported on the development of this university discussion. This quarter we have decided to publish a number on the problems of academic freedom. The reason for this choice is, of course, in the first place that academic freedom seems to be acutely threatened from various directions. Totalitarian systems are still at work in communist and fascist countries, and it now appears that the very resistance to these systems has tended to become itself totalitarian, and witch hunting has become a real threat in the very universities which claim to stand for intellectual liberty. It is particularly sad that in too many instances academic freedom is infringed upon or even destroyed altogether in the name of Christianity. We think too easily of cases in which Roman Catholicism has become an alibi for the establishment of some system of intellectual authoritarianism, but there are certainly many cases in which Protestants have, sometimes without even being conscious of it, behaved in a similar way.

Authoritarian danger

However, we cannot confine ourselves to a rather pessimistic inquiry into the present condition of academic freedom throughout the world. The second and more fundamental reason for this number is to call to the attention of S.C.M. members and Christian intellectuals in general another question which seems worth considering. In discussing academic freedom we are faced with two opposite dangers. One is that of giving up this freedom for the sake of some values which we consider

particularly precious. This is clearly what is happening today in the realm of political freedom, when in the defence of a political order in which freedom is defined as central, the practical liberties of men are seriously endangered.

As Christians, we face this temptation when, for instance, we speak too easily of a Christian university. What would a Christian university really be? An institution where all teaching would be checked by Christian theology or approved by church authorities? Or do we think rather of a community in which all men, whether teachers or students, would be equally free to present their own convictions about truth, provided they do so clearly and honestly? Only thus can there be a real confrontation between conflicting views.

Freedom and responsibility

But the authoritarian danger is not the only one. We are also tempted very often to make freedom into a fetish, assuming that when it is formally respected all is well. This may also be a danger for Christians at the present time, particularly those in the Western world. It seems that here the study of academic freedom cannot be divorced from that of academic responsibility. It might be possible, though not very probable, in a world which is moving with increasing speed towards political regimes of a totalitarian character, that islands of freedom could be preserved in the universities. We remember how in the last days of the Roman Empire, in the midst of mounting chaos and under pressure from the empire and the Church, both of which claimed absolute authority, groups of cultured men still preserved a sense of freedom. But we should also remember that this small *élite* was ultimately irrelevant. They preserved freedom, respect for truth and beauty, but they did it outside of society. To preserve traditional values, they had to pay the tremendous price of enclosing themselves in ivory towers. Are not our universities today becoming in many ways ivory towers, and therefore irrelevant? When we fight for academic freedom, we must do so in the midst of the world. This means that we must both struggle against threats of the world to our university, and also open this same university as completely as possible to the impact of a world which has

lost the sense of the values for which the university stands. We can claim the right to academic freedom provided we fully assume the burden of academic responsibility towards society.

Finally, we should seriously ask ourselves this question: what do we really mean by freedom? In what way is our Christian conception of freedom really Christian, really informed by our faith in Jesus Christ, rather than by our cultural or political prejudices? Such a question is indeed much broader in scope than the university question; it affects our whole conception of the life of the Church within the world. It may be that an effort of thinking about academic freedom will contribute to this more general task, and, conversely, in thinking about academic freedom we should keep in mind what we believe about freedom in general, remembering particularly that our understanding of it is bound up with the sense of our evangelistic responsibility. We are concerned with human freedom not only because it is a good thing in itself, but also as an implication of the missionary task of the Church: the Church must be free to announce Jesus Christ in His fulness and men must be free responsibly to respond to this message.

* * *

We are particularly happy to be able to include in this number two articles representing points of view which are bound to provoke reaction and disagreement among readers of *The Student World*: that by Father Kaelin on "A Catholic Looks at Academic Freedom", which represents a Roman Catholic point of view, and the contribution of Victor Malinin on "The University and Freedom of Education in the U.S.S.R.", which represents a communist point of view. While preparing this number of *The Student World* on "Academic Freedom", we thought that one of the implications of our concern as Christians for academic freedom was precisely to give an opportunity for expression of their own viewpoints to those groups with whom members of the Federation would most probably disagree. No academic freedom is possible if it is limited to the study of the attitudes of ideologies or religious convictions which we already know and accept. *The Student World* may perhaps contribute in a modest way to the cause of academic freedom by remaining a forum where all opinions can freely be expressed. PH. M.

Academic Freedom, Social Responsibility and the Christian Message

E. VAN BRUGGEN

The commission of the last Federation General Committee on "Our Place and Responsibility in the University" refrained in its report from "normative definitions or descriptions in advance of what is called 'the university'", because these "lend themselves to our preoccupation with old, static concepts which can have no reality or appeal as norms for most parts of the world". The commission felt that "the university can be best defined anew only through the ways in which the members of the university live and function in day-to-day life in terms of specific issues"¹.

Nevertheless, the commission had already given a definition of the university by the negative method, excluding "two erroneous conceptions of (its) nature ... The first consists in making the university the servant of any ideology and so accentuating the pragmatic nature of knowledge ... The second consists in (the university) confining itself exclusively to this realm of knowledge pursued for its own sake and apart from contemporary conditions." Positively stated this means: "... the first duty of the university is to go as far as possible in the pursuit of truth ... in complete independence of historical and social forces", and also that "the social and cultural functions of the university should be given great importance"².

These two propositions are more or less the terms on which the S.C.M. as a university movement is willing to live in joint responsibility with the university. But here, I think, we must raise the question: are we prepared for the dilemma into which this juxtaposition of our *desiderata* puts us? Does our Christian

¹ Minutes of the Meeting of the General Committee of the World's Student Christian Federation, Spiritual Life Centre, Nasrapur, India, January 9 to 21, 1953, p. 33.

² *Ibid.*, p. 32.

point of view really enable us to help the university in solving the enormous problem of academic freedom on the one hand and social and cultural responsibility on the other ?

An independent and responsible university ?

If ever there was a specific issue related to university life and function which should be taken up in terms of day-to-day life, it is this. Is it really possible for the university to maintain its complete independence in the pursuit of truth, while functioning as an instrument of social and cultural progress ? Can it really do more than be itself in the traditional way, living and working for knowledge alone, as if it were an aim in itself, without losing the essence of its existence ? Is the insistence on social and cultural responsibility a just demand on the university ?

This is a very real problem not to be settled by the fallacious sort of "Christian" indignation, which asserts that "of course" no institution in society has any right to exist if it has no appropriate program of direct social and cultural service. It is a real problem for our scholars, scientists and students, who acknowledge the validity of both our above-mentioned propositions, but for whom the possibility of a harmonious combination of the two in a workable program seems very questionable. We must not criticize them too easily, but, if we want to prove that our concern for the university is thorough-going solidarity, we must try to understand ourselves how our situation today makes a solution very difficult ¹.

Briefly stated, the problem seems to be this : in the eighteenth and nineteenth century academic knowledge was more or less identified with social and cultural progress. It stood against superstition and ignorance which seemed to hamper the evolution of society. Because there was only a small *élite* who could handle such knowledge, this "upper tenth" was given a free hand, with admiration and awe. This was the reason why the modern university obtained the independence for which it is struggling today.

¹ For many of the following arguments I am indebted to Dr. C. J. Dippel. See his article in *Wending*, 1951.

But now, after a technical and social revolution, in which academic knowledge became widely spread and used, and in the midst of a "managerial revolution", through which science is becoming more and more a weapon in the struggle for power, it is not the scholar or scientist, but the planning manager and the technician, together with the politician, who lead on the way of human progress, for better or for worse. These men all need academic knowledge and will buy it at handsome prices or press it into their service by more subtle means. They even like the glory and prestige of academic integrity around their own heads. Doing things "scientifically" is still a sign of respectability. Much of the independence of academic life rests on its indispensability to the new masters of our world, and is therefore very much threatened by it.

Only through these new masters, and by serving them, can the university hope to fulfil its responsibility to society in contemporary conditions. But in so doing, it endangers its very conception of truth, because for the new leaders of society it is always the ideological aspects of truth and the pragmatic nature of knowledge which are most important. We must bear this in mind when we try to convince scholars and scientists of their responsibility to their fellow men. Their aloofness often hides their embarrassment that they cannot see their way to serve society directly, without renouncing the principles to which they have dedicated their lives.

The power of science

While the university has had to retreat to a secondary place in leadership, scientific knowledge has become more and more valuable, until now it is indispensable to the very existence of modern society. It has become a power with immense possibilities, and the struggle for its control is one of the big problems of our day. In all the important countries the state is taking science into its own hands. The laboratory is the first line of defence, and the scientist the indispensable warrior, because knowledge precedes pushbuttons, and theory precedes its application. Science is also mobilized — by the state — for the war against economic chaos, poverty and disease.

Another participant in the struggle for the control of the power of science is industry, where even basic research is organized in the hope of profit. There is real science in the laboratories of our big plants, very well equipped and widely organized into many teams. It has even been scientifically proven that this method — science for given aims — yields more practical results than the more inefficient, more individualistic, academic way. In industrial research the pragmatic nature of knowledge is not only accented, but — under the pressure of the profit motive — even advanced as the only reason for its existence.

Public opinion has already adopted this view. Mere learning no longer commands respect. Accounts in the press of academic controversies, which reveal the genuine, academic method of the pursuit of truth, are met with impatience. The popularization of science and learning have led people to expect definitive statements and practical results: a new and true view of the world (*Weltbild*), or a way of life, as well as vitamins, cigarettes without nicotine, or moon-going rockets. Behind this pragmatization of science and all *Wissenschaft*, often appear the hidden ideologies of politics, big business and the man on the street. These and other ideologies compete for the support of science. Even in our irrational age, many modern "beliefs", often Christian in name, try to demonstrate that they are upheld by science or consider themselves the true foundation upon which science should build.

Tension and competition

It is not so easy in this climate for the university to maintain its standards of academic integrity. It is much easier to follow the flow of today's social and cultural "progress" and to serve it, than to keep out. Bigger salaries and better equipment entice scholars and scientists to leave the sphere of academic freedom. Funds for its maintenance are often given for special purposes only. Even the state is inclined to forget that its universities have to cultivate other academic disciplines than those of "science", and that if these do not flourish, academic life will wither. More and more students must be educated as

specialists and technicians. It is very difficult for the university not to forget its social and cultural obligations!

Perhaps all this ought to be quite immaterial to the real scholar or scientist, as long as he is left free to do his own work in his own way in the ivory tower of the university. But the more he feels his responsibility to society, the more uneasy he feels, and often he falls victim to influences and suggestions from outside. When not happily absorbed in his scientific activities, he sometimes wonders about their ineffectiveness. Professors and students often reveal this sense of inferiority, this feeling of frustration, of not doing "the thing that really matters". This uneasy feeling of not being appreciated by society not only leads to many tensions between persons and disciplines, each trying, with all sorts of little private ideologies, to be at least as important as possible in the common sphere of the university, but it also compels our scholars and scientists to compete with science and learning, as it functions outside, for bigger, better and more spectacular results, or to furnish the ideologies society seems to clamor for. Of course, nothing can be said against the reorganization of the university for greater effectiveness, nor can we hold it against an eminent scholar or scientist when he turns philosopher and tries to interpret the world and humanity at large in the light of his specialized knowledge. But we always have to ask if the pursuit of truth in the academic way is really furthered by this. By far the majority of the fundamental discoveries appear to have been made in the traditional, individualistic, academic sphere, and all of them have been made by specialists, sometimes within, sometimes on the boundaries, of their own branches of science. In light of this, we may perhaps ask if it is not more to the point to discuss first the social and cultural responsibility of society to leave the university its freedom, before putting the university face to face with its social obligations!

"Do not disturb"

"Knowledge for its own sake" is the traditional goal of the university, the essence of its existence, even if it seems aimless and without foundation, compared with knowledge as it functions outside in society, where there seems to be no doubt

about what science is for, and where an enticing ideology can always be found for its justification.

We must understand those in the university who steel themselves against influences from the outside. They write "Do not disturb" on the doors of their studies and laboratories and go on working in all sobriety. Our concern for the university may take the form of sympathy for them, even if their resistance against attacks from without makes them rather dogmatic about the purity of all knowledge, or if an appeal to their social conscience seems not to penetrate, or if we find that they try to meet their cultural, social and religious obligations in a way quite unrelated to their academic professions. We must also try to appreciate their struggle for academic freedom, if they seem rather unapproachable when we bring the Christian message as it is presented in our concern for the university. The meaning of all life in Christ and the unity of truth in Him, with all its consequences, may sound in their ears like just another ideology that wants to "make sense" of their work and to put it to "good use". This is the misunderstanding we must always try to avoid, because, in our zeal and good faith, we are not always aware of how often our approach makes this unfavourable impression.

Committed communities

The Church and the university are both committed communities. Neither can meet all the demands society makes on it. Both are very susceptible to the corruption of their own faith, hope and love through absorption in temporal affairs. I do not think it improper to put them side by side in this way. Confessors and professors should be able to understand each others' positions. They could be of great help to each other in preserving the essence of their existences. I think this is the way in which we should serve the university first of all, and with this in mind we should study the different fields of knowledge with loving care.

The Bandung report ¹ mentions that in many countries of Asia rationalism and secularism stand for the liberation of the

¹ *The Idea of a Responsible University in Asia Today*. A report of the Asian University Teachers' Consultation, Bandung, 1951.

human from the irrational impersonality of ancient static collectivism. I am sure that both of these — not as ideologies but as they function in the academic way of acquiring knowledge — are also indispensable in the fight for the liberation of the human from the irrational impersonality of modern dynamic collectivism. During the occupation in Holland, as elsewhere, the crisis of the university did not prevent it from standing very close to the churches in the struggle for human freedom. It could be that in this must be found the all-important social and cultural function of the university. It is a duty imposed on the university by the essence of its existence.

'A bold and admirable project'

To indicate how this duty could be fulfilled, I will mention, as one example out of many, some ideas of a leading Dutch sociologist, Professor F. L. Polak. He makes a virtue of necessity. More and more the university is called upon to provide society with the scientific manpower, the managers in every field of life in modern society, the masters of today's world whose occupational patterns we saw to differ so widely from those of the university. Why not educate these men in responsible leadership? This could be achieved, Polak thinks, by stressing and integrating the social sciences in academic life, making them accessible to all students, and using them as an instrument by which the university could fulfil its responsibility in and to society without losing its academic integrity. It has to pay an old debt. In its preoccupation with the natural sciences, the university was slow to make man himself an object of its studies, and even then, Polak says, "the social scientists have followed the timeless and impersonal way of physics as the ideal of acquiring knowledge. They have striven after an absolute separation between science and society, between the scientific worker and the man." But to serve society, the social sciences have to find their own methods for studying him in such a way that the results can be used directly in the planning of modern life. Social sciences should always be applicable and applied sciences, and should base themselves on proven norms for the right way of community life, within the living

traditions of a given situation. Only this form of social science could make bearable the enormous tensions of the present transition of the old world to the new. In every field the new leaders of society should be made fully and rationally conscious of the dangers and possibilities of the world they live in, and they should learn how to react, and how to handle in a responsible way the men they have to lead. All students should be educated in this social and cultural responsibility ; they should be taught to use knowledge and technical inventions without being used by them, and how to cooperate for this purpose.

Polak feels that it is the duty of the university to bridge the "social and cultural lag", the gap between our technical knowledge and our cultural development. To check the moral regression of today the university should spread far and wide its scientific information about man, and teach its use with the best qualities of scholar and scientist : patience, discrimination and intellectual thoroughness. For this social and moral education the democratization of the university should be pushed as far as possible : students from all social classes should really meet each other in a reformed student life. From this Polak expects the easing of political tensions and mitigation of ideological controversies. The university should also be made responsible for the enlightenment of all students about national and international relations and the real aims and possibilities of international politics, in order to prepare them for international cooperation.

This is a very brief summary of a bold and admirable project. By taking it up, the university could regain its old leadership and make the technician, the manager and the politician dependent on its knowledge. It would earn its independence again by directing those upon whose decisions academic freedom depends.

As for myself, I am not so sure of this. I think that in thus assuming responsibility for society, the university will find it very difficult to maintain its unity and integrity and very easy to leave the narrow path of truth to which it is committed. This is only one of many unsolved problems which are raised in my mind by Polak's solution.

Helpmate of the university

But what is important here is that the university, to keep its academic freedom and realize the social responsibility that goes with it, will have to make a virtue of necessity, as pointed out by Polak. To live it must risk its life consciously and willingly. If this happens — and we must work and pray for it — the Christian message will be more important than ever in the academic sphere. The prophetic voice is only allowed on specific issues and in sharply-defined situations of real danger. Our concern, rooted in our joint responsibility with the university, will bring us to see more clearly that the only helpmate the university has in keeping within its limitations, while meeting its "temporal" obligations, is the Christian Church, because the Church itself, in its own sphere is faced by exactly the same problem as the university: how to be responsible for, and function in complete solidarity with, the world without becoming unfaithful to its own narrow way. Perhaps we may say that the university, in its grave responsibility for leading man in the right way of living, can only do so when guided somehow by Christian faith, hope and love. But it is better that we do not say so for fear of over-estimating ourselves, as we Christians are so inclined to do. It is better that as Christian teachers and students we try to be humble witnesses, in our day-to-day lives with our neighbours, in the academic sphere, to Him, who is not only the Truth, but also the Way and the Life.

Academic Life, Political Community and State Intervention

MAURICIO LOPEZ

The Enlightenment, which Kant considered as corresponding culturally to the adult age of reason — man being elevated from his guilty minority — believed with overwhelming optimism, and with it later the whole of the nineteenth century, in the power of education to raise the spiritual and moral level of the people, and to make them fully conscious of their social and political responsibility.

Neither these ideals nor hopes are any longer shared today. For various reasons, education has failed to satisfy those aspirations, and has suffered serious reverses with the appearance of totalitarian barbarism, on the one hand, and the depreciation of spiritual values apparent in the popularization of culture, on the other. Humanity has not yet fully recovered from the tragic spectacle offered by peoples, justly considered as among the most cultured of the earth, suddenly converted into protagonists of cruelties and baseness which we had thought finally banished from the field of history. Nazism, for instance, was a regression to the primitive instincts which the Enlightenment sought to overcome. The outlook is no more promising in the countries which have succeeded in maintaining their democratic structure. The former cultural monopoly of the aristocracy has given way to popular education, necessitated by the demands of the masses with their impact upon the life of the political communities. With the rise of the man of the masses and at the expense of higher education, there appears a superficial but inferior culture, mild and dulling, with disquieting indications of threatening the quality of intelligence and the higher values of the mind. Today the size of the school population, the diversity of social backgrounds, and the urgent need for production in an ever-increasingly technical and

specialized age, result in education being designed for the benefit of the great majority and not of small minority groups.

The concern which such a situation has aroused in the discerning intellects of the day has been directed towards saving man from the grave threats of slavery and dehumanization looming over him. The well-known Dutch historian, Huizinga, in his *Apollon* warned of the need for each man, while maintaining and preserving his spiritual self, to avoid allowing himself either to be blinded or stunned by the powerful means employed in our time to sway the masses, or letting himself be misled by barbarism. We must, stresses Maritain, hasten the advent of a new humanism which will rediscover the integrity of man and respect his unique position in the universe.

Educational needs

The solution will not lie in the bourgeois individualism which disfigures the face of man, nor in the Marxist collectivism which obscures his features. Both ignore the fundamental truth of human existence, which is not the isolated individual or the isolated collectivity, but man together *with* man, in a degree beyond the subjective and yet this side of the objective, which we could call the sphere of communion of persons. Hence education in our day should strive to lessen the gap between social and individual demands, apparent in the very heart of the human conscience, and also to put a final end to the separation between the plane of religion and the secular activity of the modern masses, who are deprived of spiritual culture and are atheist to an extent that we cannot even imagine.

To the foregoing must be added the urgent need for vocational training, highly diversified, demanded by the division of social work and the scientific specialization which, while giving man a vast and powerful mastery over nature, has left him in the dark with regard to a studied and complete conception of reality. It is certain that the educational techniques of classical humanism, with its leisured rhythm and its foundation in classical texts, are now inadequate in face of the new responsibilities confronting education, but its creative ideal, which

made of man a full and responsible person with a great breadth of horizons, subsists. The Western tradition at its noblest has stressed the existence of a hierarchy in which, to use an expression beloved of Bergson, the mystical prevailed over the mechanical. These reflections are pertinent if we consider that scientific humanism, called to replace classical humanism, has not fulfilled the hopes placed in it. Science has not brought happiness to man, nor has it supplied the answer to his most profound and urgent questions. We would add that popular education, with no other instrument than the strict sciences and their methods, is very much open to question.

This general picture, with its inevitable schematic poverty, at least serves to prompt us to ask ourselves about our own conduct as members of the university, in the conviction that it is at the level of higher studies that educational problems are the most numerous and pressing.

The contemporary university

University life has not followed easy paths just latterly. In the totalitarian countries, it has led a pale existence, irrevocably condemned to be a forum for the expression of the doctrine of the prevailing political system and a barrier directed against those who do not support it. In Moscow, relativist physics, and above all quantum physics, have been condemned as being pessimistic, bourgeois and reactionary. In the democratic countries, the great majority of them affected by serious social disturbances, the university, although shaken in many places by the winds of reform, is undergoing an internal crisis of major or lesser importance varying with the case.

It is difficult, in consequence, to take a calm and broad view of this confused situation. A wealth of questions, varying from the nature and function of the university to its position in relation to the surrounding world, troubles the vision of the university man of today. It is common knowledge that the higher centres of study have absorbed a tremendous number of young people from new classes of society, the majority lacking any family academic tradition, and being more preoccupied with social advancement than in submitting to the rigorous condi-

tions which the cultivation of the spirit imposes. It is no less evident that the university has not been able to escape the influence of a world rent by acute ideological tensions, in boundless conflict, which like unwelcome intruders have penetrated within its walls. Thus, an alumni, so increased and of such a heterogeneous character, which violently rocks its foundation, has led the university to question with increasing insistency its very essence and function. What is the course to follow without compromising its authentic mission — the investigation, diffusion and conservation of truth?

Possible answers

We believe, following what we consider a successful line of thought, that there are three possible answers and that they condition every possible line of action.

The first is the "ivory tower" attitude. It consists of disinterest in surrounding reality, and inner preoccupation with the eternal questions as yet unsullied by pavement passions: a complete schism between the life of the university faculty and outer events. Is such an attitude practicable? Our reply is in the negative. The difficulties of achieving such a type of university rest upon the impossibility of tracing so positive a border-line. The world, with its images and sounds, will penetrate into the farthest recesses. Moreover, this exaggerated isolation is detrimental to an educational system which must return to civic life a youth fitted for a fruitful co-existence among men.

The second is the "militant attitude". The university must face up to the social conflicts, participate — professors and students with weapons in hand — in the public life of the nation, and extend within its own limits the social, cultural and political conflicts and tensions. It thus becomes a kind of mirror and conscience of the external crisis and a forum for the doctrines of the predominant systems.

A university so conceived, out of its specific course — for academic life in a totalitarian country is nothing less — ends by destroying its own structure and reason for existence. It is the concern of intellectual life to subject theories to critical

examination, but not that, transported from this level, they should become elements of conflict between individuals and groups. The solution of militancy, in the service of a strong and predominant power, puts an end to the university as a centre for the dissemination of knowledge.

The third attitude is that of "participation". The university must not live apart from the political community, nor lead an existence marred by the pressure of social groups or the power of the state. It should, in its status of university, and not as an ideological lever, be receptive to every idea, doctrine or conception with a claim to the truth, and subject it to searching and unprejudiced examination. This task should be confined to the strict limits of objective investigation, so that anything of pedagogic emphasis circulating in the city may meet, in the serenity of the lecture hall or laboratory, with just and unbiased consideration.

We do not conceal our decided preference for this third attitude, and feel bound to observe that the destiny of the university with such a sense of participation is intimately linked with the destiny of the democratic society. Its existence is only possible against a general background of freedom; should the contrary prevail, the very problem of its existence would hold no meaning. The essential question now is to know how the university should exercise the privileges granted it by a free society.

Objective and obligation

In the first place, it seems to us that the university should never waver from its primary objective which, first and foremost, and in the words of Newman, is "to impart universal knowledge". Or, as Whitehead clearly stated in his work, *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*, the university studies are the great period of generalization. "In the university, study should start from general ideas and consider their application to concrete cases." We do not overlook that the university period coincides with the period of vocational specialization, but for this reason alone there is no need to give up the study of those branches which, by their universal character, provide a comprehensive knowledge of man and of the world.

There are, however, tasks which the participating university must not neglect without betraying its meaning. This is not the moment to enumerate them, but it is the moment to place ourselves in a position enabling us to understand and justify them. No-one, without deceiving himself, and this because in a large measure he is an actor therein, can ignore the dissolution and loosening of the fundamental bonds of the political community. We are conscious of a social vacuum in which the individual seems capable only of abandonment and isolation. In the face of such a situation, which tears at the roots of the social structure, the university, the centre of higher culture, must in all conscience feel responsible, in the common interest, for an educational development to promote brotherly fellowship among men. The Christian educator is well aware of this because, as a Christian, he bases his faith on an open society united to a hereafter with a promise of total liberation in a new city, which makes way for the faithful, and also for adversaries, because the faithful will hope for them.

The world of the future must view an advance in the sphere and influence of the task of education, which will form the principal and decisive nucleus of a civil society conscious of the dignity of the people and the historical appearance of common humanity. It is in the supreme interest of the new civilization that the education be of free men for a community equally free.

State intervention

The relationship between the university and public authority falls within the wider field of freedom of teaching and state monopoly. This problem reached enormous importance during the past century, and resulted in the victory of state intervention, but with an ample margin for the free play of private initiative. These were the initial skirmishes of the growing influence of the state over all aspects of social life: religion, race, marriage, economy, culture, practices and customs.

The total power of the state, fruit of a false political conception which perverted its very nature, stifled private initiative to the point of extinction. It must, however, be recognized that the general disregard of human solidarity and justice which prevailed during the first phases of the industrial revolution,

necessitated state administration to give effect to labour legislation demanded in the common good. And without doubt, the state was obliged to impose this as a normal exercise of its power. But it is another thing when the state, in a distorted conception of its sovereignty, suppresses the freedom of initiative, appropriating to itself the direction and control of all organs of the social structure, thus exceeding the genuine intervention pertaining to it as supreme arbiter and supervisor of the national life.

Education and the state

In the educational realm it must be noted that, in our time, with society seriously affected in its innermost structure, the tendency is not in favour of a return to a system which contemplates only purely private initiative ; and this for very noteworthy reasons. The democratic state has had to supervise the education of its citizens in defence of its historical existence. Moreover, it is impossible for private endeavour to see to the general education of the people in view of the enormous expense and the complex administration involved. Finally, and we do not exhaust the fund of reasons, there is the indispensable need for a general educational body to care for the education of the members of all classes of society, without regard for their social or economic position. Hence no country in the world is without an educational system state-organized or state-supervised in one way or another.

The matter, however, becomes complicated when it comes to establishing the limits of state education. The solutions vary from the complete monopoly of Soviet education to the mere pedagogical orientation of Great Britain, with an intermediate sequence of the greatest diversity. We shall not linger over the former, as in reality there is no dividing line to establish ; it is all fixed in advance. The rest cannot be judged according to a general standard, due to historical and social circumstances evident in each country, but they at least admit of some common consideration.

Thus it is that all democratic states, in their educational institutions, recognize individual freedom and respect for the ideas and beliefs of their members. Private effort can establish

and maintain educational institutions, subject, naturally, to the laws of the state. Here, we believe we find the true meaning of the freedom of teaching. There are, however, no fundamental obstacles to the state's founding its own institutions without prejudice to private ones. This is confirmed by the experience of various Saxon nations where, together with official institutions — universities, colleges, institutes — there exist private educational bodies of long and distinguished tradition.

In some countries, state monopoly is characterized by the award and recognition of official degrees, to the prejudice of diplomas awarded by private institutions. Such intervention results in the elimination of the possibility of a true stimulus between the various educational centres, and lessens the cultivation of purely educational vocations, things which do not occur against a background of educational freedom which leaves some margin for unofficial action.

The very interest of the nation, and at the same time the progress of science and culture, bar state monopoly. It is essential for the public good that both individuals and institutions should be able to pursue their educational activity freely, with only such state intervention as is necessary to prevent abuse or remedy deficiencies. Always, and in any case, the state educational activity should be flexible and comprehensive enough to embrace new ideas and enterprises of various kinds. In this way is respected the freedom of initiative of the most important factors of social life — family, cultural institutions, trade unions, etc. — and education loses the abstract and remote character which to a great extent it possesses.

Responsible freedom

The participating university must not belittle these requirements. The university body should heed the demands of the public interest. This is where it touches against the sphere of the state, and where it will admit of a legitimate supervision which, without altering the basic standards and methods of teaching, would keep the educational body informed as to the needs affecting the life of the community. Thus the participating university, without failing in its specific purposes, will

strengthen the foundations of a democratic society, in the conviction that this society cannot flourish unless all institutions are properly directed towards democratic ends. It is nothing more than the application of a wise principle which comes down to us from Aristotle, and which says that social stability depends upon the adaptation of education to the form of government.

Today, in almost the whole free world, the autonomy of the university is recognized, in adherence to the truest tradition which recognizes the university as a body of professors and students, with a life and purposes of its own : those of teaching, vocation and investigation.

The essential condition of spiritual life is freedom. If this be lacking — we speak of political freedom — there is neither education nor culture. The freedom of teaching, therefore, constitutes one of the pillars of national greatness ; where the contrary is the case, it falls into the uniformity of the "production of a type" which levels all and ennobles nothing. The freedom in question, however, is a responsible freedom, which has nothing in common with the anarchic nature of bourgeois individualism. Few have expressed it better than Denis de Rougemont in his *German Journal* : "If culture and our civic liberties are suppressed through a materialistic doctrine and state, we should know that we are responsible in so far as we nurture a spirit separated from reality, an abstentionist and unfruitful freedom." And this was said to Christians.

A Catholic Looks at Academic Freedom

JEAN DE LA CROIX KAELEN, O.P.

I. NATURE AND BASIS

The university is an institution of higher learning. Responsible for the transmission of higher knowledge, values and superior methods, it should be directly connected with the creative work of the intellect in such a way that it may include both the pursuit of truth and the spreading of knowledge.

Thus the university as such has a specific purpose to fulfil for the commonweal, here considered as that society whose common good includes the specific ends of the smaller communities of which it is composed.

Academic freedom can be viewed in two ways. It means the freedom which the university must exercise as an institution responsible for the teaching of its faculty, freedom from the state as well as from forces of money and politics. On the other hand, it designates, within the university, the freedom which the professors themselves should enjoy in order to teach the material which has been confided to them.

Academic freedom seen in this first sense, that is, as being opposed to all pressure coming from without, is based in the (relative) autonomy that a particular institution has the right to claim from other particular societies and from the state itself¹. In another direction it is founded upon the demands which are natural both to truth² and to the freedom of the mind.

¹ We will investigate the limitations of this freedom in the second section.

² By truth we here mean scientific or philosophic truth as well as historical truth or technical rules, in a word, all that which is of importance on the cultural level insofar as it depends upon the university. Thus we are deliberately leaving aside divine truth known through revelation, since this has the right not to academic but to evangelical freedom.

The transcendence of truth

The intelligence-truth (or object to be known) relationship is a relationship which *of itself* admits of no outside constraint. By nature the operating human reason knows only one constraint: the object of its reflection, whether this is imposed on it by evidence (the evidence of a primary principle or of a fact), or whether it attains it through the difficult and risky paths of demonstration, induction or other methods of knowing. There is no force which can oblige the intelligence to say something is white when it knows that it is black, or to affirm as certain something which it grasps as probable, or to adapt truth to the wishes of the heart or the passions, even if these are of the highest order. The compulsion which the object exercises over reason is natural and thus completes rather than violates reason. It is the measure of its independence in face of sentimental or police interference.

Truth requires still other things of freedom. Once known, it demands to be taught and shared. Man does not live by bread alone. The word of the Gospel shows that divine truth alone brings salvation. Provided that the distinction between the level of salvation or grace and that of temporal existence or culture is affirmed, it is not wrong to apply it also to all human spiritual values which man needs as much as bread. The ideal of human life on the temporal level is not that each should be assured of the advantages of wealth or of easy comfort, but "to procure the common good of the multitude in such a manner that each concrete person, not only in a privileged class but throughout the whole mass, may truly reach that measure of independence which is proper to civilized life and which is ensured alike by the economic guarantees of work and property, political rights, civil virtues and the cultivation of the mind."¹

It is in this perspective that the university institutions to which the Middle Ages gave birth are placed. And it was precisely these Middle Ages which had a very sure idea of the autonomy proper to the university.

¹ JACQUES MARITAIN, *Man and the State*. University of Chicago Press, 1951, p. 54

It is in the name of the values of the mind and the transcendence of truth, as well as the fundamental right of man to know the true, that the university claims academic freedom. When race, party or business become the supreme values, it is clear that academic freedom can do nothing but yield to a menial servitude.

II. ITS LIMITATIONS

Academic freedom, however, is no more an absolute than any other human liberty. The extent of its exercise is directly connected to the good of the human person which, in its turn, is ultimately referred back to God alone. But, on the other hand, truth is difficult and man does not reach it without risks. The higher one climbs on the ladder of knowledge, passing from the technical and scientific sphere to the philosophic and ethical, the more one sees certitudes giving way to opinions and general consent becoming exhausted in contradictory positions. This should invite the university to modesty. The university might undoubtedly pretend to uncontrolled liberty were it miraculously preserved from error, or were the spread of truth always supervised according to the requirements of the common good (the Kinsey report, even if it had the objective value accorded to it by its authors, still should not be indiscriminately taught).

The reality is altogether different. The university does not enjoy the privilege of infallibility. A human institution which is not destined to pass beyond history into the Kingdom of Heaven, it is ordered to the common good of the multitude, which is a common temporal good of human persons who have a supra-temporal destiny. It is in order to safeguard the inalienable dignity of these persons and to protect their essential rights, that the university in its teaching is submitted to a supervision which must measure the value of this teaching against the most profound requirements of man.

From where should such control come? Some will say from the state. But, except in extreme cases, this would not be desirable for several reasons. It is first of all necessary to draw attention to a distinction which is too little known and which alone, to our way of thinking, permits of a resolution — at least

on the level of principles (the level of that which ought to be) — of this delicate problem. It concerns the distinction between the state and the body politic¹.

State intervention

When a citizen or a group of citizens or any institution within the nation defends itself against what we call the meddling of the state, we are all at least vaguely aware of this distinction. This healthy and spontaneous reaction is proof of it. The state is a functional, structural and mainly political organism. It is the dominant part, the specialized organism for the promotion of the common good through law and justice. It is at the service of the body politic. And the common good of the latter prevails over the immediate end of the state, which is the preservation of civic order. The vice of the totalitarian state is precisely that it maintains civic order without any real reference to the common good of the persons who make up the body politic, that is, by the oppression of persons and of living communities of the nation. It is thus easy to conceive of how the totalitarian state leads fatally towards an arrogation of an absolute right of censure and control over the university.

The distinction made above permits an understanding of why we judge the power of censure exercised by the state to be dangerous — except in cases of necessity — not only for academic freedom but for freedom itself. The state is not sufficiently prepared to distinguish the true from the false, the beautiful from the ugly. That it intervenes — but always with the proper institutional guarantee of law and justice — to prohibit teaching which aims at producing traitors, sectarians or fanatics, or at the ruin of the spiritual heritage of the people, is its right and its duty; for there is a task incumbent upon it to protect the people, and their most essential rights. But in doing this it takes no ideological position. False ideas are combatted not by quarantines or by police measures, but by right ideas. And the state has no ideas; it defends those of the people, not only those which are momentarily popular but the most

¹ Cf. Maritain, *op. cit.*, ch. I.

profound, which express in the obscure consciousness of the people that which is most worthy of man.

The intervention of the state, then, is only acceptable in extreme cases, when evil passes from the brain into action and becomes, so to speak, tangible.

Supervision by the body politic

Does that mean that it is necessary to allow false ideas to produce their bitter fruits before bringing to an academic freedom which is abusive and destructive of other liberties the limits which the common good requires? We think not; but the supervision of ideas ought not to be exercised by the state (except perhaps substitutionally while waiting for the body politic to act in this regard; but, even in cases like this, the state should act with extreme distrust of its capacity). In a self-respecting democracy, the citizens themselves, or groups among them, should exercise this supervision. A body politic, aware of its own dignity, should not commit to the state a care which the state cannot accept without endangering the riches which it should wish to protect. It must find within itself the resources of intelligence and wisdom which allow it to supervise effectively the value of the intellectual, and especially the moral, nourishment distributed by the university. Where needed, the state should aid the formation of those groups in which university people would play an irreplaceable role. The aforementioned dangers of intervention by public powers would thus be avoided; moreover, this would reintegrate the university with the nation from which it has been too often separated.

Limitations on professors

As has been said, academic freedom ought also to be enjoyed by professors for their teaching. Here too this liberty can encounter just limitations.

Certain universities are identified by a definite orientation: Marxist, Christian or other. Their right not to open university chairs to professors whose ideas seem irreconcilable to the ideal upon which the university is based, an ideal which is shared by its students, cannot be denied. We will have the opportunity

to explain below why, in the case of Roman Catholics, we do not feel that this limitation at all imperils the free exercise of the intelligence, provided of course that the competence of the faculty to teach leaves nothing to be desired.

The non-confessional university has not the right to demand that its faculty members give up the idea of teaching according to their personal convictions, inasmuch as these do not undermine in a tangible way the values recognized as being the basis of a people's spiritual heritage. "Political activity on the part of professors cannot be prohibited, provided there are the necessary guarantees for the scientific objectivity of their teaching and for the students' confidence in their masters' impartiality, provided also that concord is maintained through the absence of political passions in university life and that all, individually and collectively, devote their efforts to the common good."¹

As for the Catholic teaching in a non-confessional institution, he "will unreservedly respect the rule of neutrality. This does not mean that he has to disintegrate his personality, nor to set up water-tight compartments within himself between the realm of the Spirit and that of reason. With discretion, tact and a sense of fine distinctions, he will present himself whole and entire and as he really is. He will be particularly careful, however, never to do — or seem to do — violence to his disciples' conscience, and to prevent his teaching from taking on the aspect of propaganda."²

· III. THE CHURCH AND ACADEMIC FREEDOM

We should like to handle very briefly here the responsibility of Christians in the sphere of academic freedom, and then consider at greater length the problem posed by the spiritual authority of the Church.

It is manifest that in the groups of citizens which we mentioned above, Christians, more than others, would be expected to assume responsibilities. Their faith gives them a more lucid

¹ *The Mission of the University*. Fribourg, 1953, p. 199.

² Lacombe in *op. cit.*, p. 49.

outlook on the dignity of man, on genuine spiritual and moral values and the dangers threatening the mind and heart. Without imposing upon others the beliefs which are the core of their lives, they can cooperate honestly with them. They should recognize in their contacts the sense of human realities (without counting that of divine realities of which Christians should always and everywhere be witnesses) as they have been willed by the Creator, and work in this way for the accomplishment of God's plan in things of the temporal order, the "things which are Caesar's".

They ought especially to respect the conscience of others and be open to every truth, no matter what its source or the area in which it operates. This all seems so evident that we feel it is useless to linger over it.

The more delicate question of the conciliation of liberty and authority within the Church still remains. We should like to reply at greater length to this question. We are here speaking of the Church according to the Roman Catholic conception. If we restrict ourselves to the level of principles, the problem becomes one of seeing if the Church's spiritual authority fetters this freedom which we have claimed for the intellect. The unbeliever thinks he has the answer when he brandishes in a peremptory fashion the case of Galileo. The actual situation merits more attention. It would be impossible to understand the Catholic point of view if the meaning of the Church for the Catholic were ignored.

The Church

The Church is a supernatural society, at once human and divine, in which men are united as co-citizens of the Kingdom of God, which leads them to the eternal life already begun here below ; which teaches them the deposit of revealed truth received from the Incarnate Word Himself ; which transmits to them the privileged graces of the sacraments and, in particular, nourishes them with Christ's body and blood ; which brings them together in the unique Sacrifice of the Saviour, mysteriously present at each Mass, in order that, through faith and love, they can unite themselves with Christ in the supreme act by which He redeems the world. The Church is the body of

which Christ is the head ; it is a visible body because of this profession of faith ; it is the worship and the more than human radiance of those only too rare persons who can in all truth say : "Christ is my life" ; it is an invisible body because of the mystery of divine dwelling-within, of the grace and charity which vivifies souls, even those who, without knowing Christ, seek God in truth and are not flatly opposed to His advances. The Church is a mystery of faith, or as Bossuet said, Jesus Christ poured out and communicated.

If the Church of the Middle Ages practised a veritable management of the political society and the university (which owed its existence to it), it was because the political society of the time had not yet reached maturity and because, in fact, the Church had to compensate for many deficiencies of the public order and, since it formed the civilization, assume the responsibility for many functions and duties which of themselves belong to the temporal order. To be scandalized by this, or to want to return to similar conditions, is to suffer from a singular lack of historical vision. In spite of the grandeur of the work accomplished by the Church at that time, the Catholic may rejoice in seeing it relieved of a trust which was too heavy to be carried without peril by men who were far from being all saints. But, for all this, the Church has not given up the exercise of its spiritual mission to intellects. With vigilant jealousy it guards the sacred deposit of divine revelation formulated by God Himself in human words.

The Magisterium

It knows that, according to the promises of Christ, it is divinely assisted by the Holy Spirit in preserving itself without tarnish, becoming better and better aware of itself, and offering itself to men throughout time. In all ages it has explained truths proclaimed in this humanly inexhaustible deposit, driven by the necessity of defending revealed truth against errors, either through what the ancients called the *sensus Ecclesiae*, the unified aspirations of Christian piety and theological reflection, or by the challenge presented to the intellect by great cultural or scientific events. Of this progress, comparable to the grain of mustard seed becoming an immense tree, the ecclesiastical

Magisterium is the sole judge and, as such, is divinely aided by an assistance which includes, in major cases, strict doctrinal infallibility ¹.

In such a case the faithful know that through the Church's proposition they are adhering to Christ Himself ; for the Christ to whom their living faith adheres is for them not only the words of the Gospel but also those of Ephesus and Chalcedon. Thus are realized the words of Christ : "He who listens to you, listens to Me."

Outside of cases involving strict "infallibility", divine assistance does not confer exceptional authority on teachings of the Magisterium. Its doctrinal significance is to be measured each time according to the context, the form, the intention and the object of the decree. It is fallible, especially when it comes from Roman Congregations and without the Pope's being expressly responsible (as was the case with Galileo), as, for example, if it intends to determine whether or not it is prudent or sure to hold that such or such a statement conforms to Scripture. Because he knows that the Church is assisted by the Holy Spirit, and because he knows that there can be no contradiction between the truth of what his reason discovers and that which God has revealed, the Catholic is bound by the spiritual authority of the Church, when it requires an absolute adhesion to divine truth such as is proposed to him by the Church. The obedience of the Faith does not at all fetter his free research. It rather sharpens it by fortifying it with the sense of love for truth in which it seems a reflection of uncreated Truth, no matter how humble it may be.

As Jacques Maritain has written :

Be it noted, furthermore, that, as a matter of fact, no government is less authoritarian than the government of the Catholic Church. It governs without police force and physical coercion

¹ The following are the precise cases : acts of the Magisterium called extraordinary in conciliar definitions or solemn proclamations ; acts of the ordinary Magisterium enhancing the common teaching given throughout the world by all the bishops in union with the Pope, or by the Pope alone, in virtue of his authority as Supreme Pastor, when he addresses the universal Church and manifests the will to settle a doctrinal point of faith or morals definitively, by imposing it irrevocably on the assent of all.

the immense people for whose spiritual common good it is responsible. Here we have a society, the order of which depends primarily on the non-material influence of human souls teaching, preaching, worshipping, and the sacramental life, and only secondarily on the external power of the law. The Pope speaks to the conscience of men, he counts upon the inner vitality of faith to make his word listened to ; to enforce his doctrinal and moral directions in the Catholic people he has recourse to the spiritual sanctions of Canon Law but on comparatively infrequent occasions ¹.

Catholic universities, while recognizing the doctrinal authority of the Church, do not intend in any way to restrict the legitimate assertions of the intellect in quest of knowledge.

Thus, the perennial striving of Catholic thought for a synthesis which will bring order into the whole field of knowledge, is therefore no totalitarian impulse, no imperialistic will to reduce everything by force to the uniformity of a single system. It derives its strength from a threefold fount of Wisdom whose unity is in God Himself, unique source both of grace and of nature, the experimental wisdom of the saints, enkindled and enlightened by a charity perfectly expressed in daily life and crowned with the gifts of the Holy Spirit ; a theological wisdom wholly designed to foster in man the development of the life of grace, and therefore appealing to the resources of human reason as instrument for the elucidation of supernatural mysteries : and finally, a philosophical wisdom flowing from the higher powers of autonomous reason, but receptive for supernatural influence and strengthening. Even by itself, this flexible gradation gives proof that the thrice repeated call to unity of Christian Wisdom places no obstacle in the way of free investigation, nor of the structural and methodological diversity of the sciences².

As is seen, the Church's authority is directly exercised only in the realm of theology, and does not touch that of philosophy, or even less so that of science, except to the degree that that faith is susceptible of being indirectly affected by these disciplines.

Restrictions imposed

Furthermore, when it must intervene, the Magisterium does not censure universities, but those ideas which it believes menace

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 185.

² LACOMBE, *op. cit.*, pp. 52-53.

the integrity of revealed truth in one way or another, and then only according to the different degrees which we have already mentioned — from dogmatic affirmations to prudential and even fallible decisions. This adhesion which the Church requires from its children also knows different degrees : that of the faith which leaves no place for doubt, and where the obedience aspect loses its importance before the aspect of mysterious communion with divine truth ; at the other rare although possible extreme, that of pure obedience. In this last case, when for instance a decision emanating from the Roman Congregation requests that an exegete not profess such or such an opinion, or when it objects to such or such a form of apostolate, it does not always intend to demand an interior assent of the intellect, but the submission of the will and practical attitude. The field is untouched, if not for teaching, at least for free research. This then is the only restriction which we see imposed on personal initiative : that of not being able to teach an opinion, evident for such a scholar but still judged not sufficiently certain for the Magisterium, or the practice of a given form of apostolate judged perilous for him.

Authority and obedience

Writing these things with a desire of objectivity, we think with some regret that the non-Catholic will never grasp the mystery of authority and obedience in the Church. Even if he exalts the latter, as sometimes happens, while seeing the Church only as a human institution, he can do it only by underestimating the value of the person ; and the doctrine of obedience, far from being in conformity with the Catholic faith, becomes immoral. It will thus be allowed us to quote here a page which may lead to a better understanding not only of the letter but also of the spirit of the obedience to the Church as it is lived by its best children.

The Catholic knows first of all that the Church commands only because it obeys God. He knows also that obedience is the price of liberty, as it is the condition of unity... Discerning as he ought the respective significance of each of the hierarchy's many and diverse acts, not separating them from one another, nor opposing one to the other, receiving them all according to what it requires, he never adopts a litigious attitude towards it,

as if he must at all cost defend a threatened autonomy... Certainly the assistance which the Spirit gives to the Spouse does not guarantee that he (the Catholic) will have only to carry out orders stemming from the best choices. The Church's history is not this absurd idyll! But at all times, whether the man who orders him in the name of God be right or wrong, whether he be blind or clairvoyant, whether his intentions be pure or mixed, from the moment that this man is invested with legitimate authority and does not command evil, the other knows that he will always be wrong if he disobeys. He knows this by an *a priori* conviction of faith which nothing may weaken; and history confirms him in this by a double series of antagonistic experiences. Even if, in certain cases, this is a hard truth it is primarily for him a "marvellous truth" (Newman)... If he finds himself hindered in the realization of what he considers the good, he remembers that, even supposing that his initiative might be just, it is not his action which is important; that the work of the Redemption in which God has called him to cooperate, is not submitted to the same laws as human enterprises; that, in fine, he has nothing else to do but to place himself in the plan of God which leads him through His representatives, that he participate thus in an infallible manner "in the infallible certainty of Providence", and that finally one never betrays any cause, that one is never unfaithful to others, to himself or to God when one simply obeys. Neither sophism, nor the appearance of good, nor the persuasion of right can veil his eyes from the impact of the two words of St. Paul who proposes to our imitation Christ *factus obediens*. Nothing can make him forget that it is by an act of total abandon that the salvation of mankind is accomplished, and that the Author of this salvation, "Son that he is, learned by His own suffering what it is to obey" (Hebrews 5: 8). This simple memory is for him the most efficacious of all theories and all talks and it will always impede him from reducing Christian obedience, the conformity to the obeying Christ, to a virtue of social obedience: to see only this aspect of it, undeniable anyway, would be in his eyes to misunderstand the better part of it¹.

¹ L. H. DE LUBAC, S.J., *Méditation sur l'Eglise*. Paris, 1953, pp. 199-202.

Confessionalism and Academic Freedom¹

The Catholic position

"The Protestant starting-point is the right to freedom, the Catholic the right to truth. Where there is conflict between these two principles, at least theoretically, truth remains supreme: even Protestants cannot deny that, though some of them are practically of the opinion that all religions are as good as one another, as if God and man could remain indifferent to the dogmatic and historical content which forms the basis and the distinguishing mark of each one of them. The Catholic Church, convinced by her divine prerogative of being the one true Church, must have sole claim to the right to freedom, for it is only to truth, and never to error, that freedom can be granted; as for other religions, the Catholic Church will not resort to violence, but will ask that, by methods which are both legitimate and worthy of the human person, they be not allowed to spread false doctrine. Thus, in a state where Catholics are in the majority, the Church will ask that legal existence be not granted to error and that, if there are minorities of a different religion, they be allowed to exist, and no more than that, and that they will not be given the opportunity of disclosing their beliefs. However, according to the extent to which either concrete circumstances, a hostile government or the numerical strength of the dissident groups are such as to prevent the total application of this principle, the Church will request for itself the most generous concessions possible, to the point of accepting as a lesser ill the legal toleration of other creeds: thus in a few countries Catholics will have to go as far as requesting themselves full religious freedom for everyone, and being content to

¹ This short article has been written by a friend of the Federation who has been able to observe the situation in Italian universities. For personal reasons he has asked to remain anonymous. The article may appear as an attack on Roman Catholicism as such. Our intention in publishing it is not to indulge in confessional controversy, but simply to give an opportunity for expression of the point of view of people who have to face the repercussions of a particular Roman Catholic attitude in university life.

be able to co-exist with others in the place where they alone have a right to exist. In this case the Church does not give up its *thesis*, which is the most imperative of laws, but adapts itself to the *hypothesis*, that is, to actual conditions, from which its concrete life cannot abstract itself."

These words, written by Father F. Cavalli, S.J., which were published in the April 1948 number of *Civiltà Catholica*, the organ of the Society of Jesus, sum up in a very clear and disconcerting way the official position of the Catholic Church *vis-à-vis* the problem of religious, as well as more general freedom, in the political and cultural aspects of the life of a nation, and therefore also in academic life. Here is how Father Cavalli justifies, in the same article, compulsory religious instruction in Spanish schools, from the elementary grades to the university: "It should be noted that neither teaching nor examinations in Catholic doctrine constitute religious persecution, unless the same be said of the teaching of Greek and Roman mythology, which is very frequent in classical schools in every country. So account must be taken of the fact that the historical and national aspect alone justifies the systematic study, by Protestant pupils as well, of the dogmatic content and historical development of Catholicism in a country where it has been to a large extent the animating spirit of politics, art and life in general. Naturally, this does not do away with the duty of Spanish teachers to act with tact and respect so as not to give offence to the odd Protestant students who may by chance be among the pupils."

Obviously the objection could be raised against Father Cavalli that Protestants believe in freedom not as *Gleichschaltung* but because they believe in the freedom of truth and the grace of God, which blows where it wills, truth and grace which cannot be the monopoly of any human authority, be it even a church. But this line of thought, which is as well known as that of the Jesuit father, would carry us too far. As for the sort of academic freedom he offers us, we are hard put to it to designate it otherwise than as a strange substitute for the "Christian freedom" preached by Luther. We fail to understand how a church as proud, and sure of having exclusive possession of the absolute truth, can offer it to non-Catholics as

nonchalantly as if it were something on the same level as Greek and Roman mythology or the historical tradition of a particular country, unless this is part of the "tact" with which one must treat the black sheep who is denied for the second time, by these very proposals, dignity and freedom.

Italian situation

If this is the Catholic conception of academic freedom, we cannot be too surprised by the following events which took place recently in Italy. In December, 1952, the Ministry of Public Instruction, on the request of the director and the two catechists of an Italian school, laid down that the history text-book for middle schools written by an Italian Protestant professor contained "numerous noteworthy theological errors", and therefore called upon the staff council of this school to suppress the text-book.

Another fact is reported by Gaetano Salvemini in an article in the Italian review, *Il Ponte*, in the January 1954 number. On November 24, 1953, the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy of the University of Messina entrusted the teaching of church history to a Protestant professor; but one of the four members of the Faculty Council questioned the expediency of giving this teaching post to someone "whose beliefs were overtly non-Catholic". On November 28, it appears that after the intervention of a Jesuit father who had already been a member of this Faculty, the Senate of the university rejected the decision of the Faculty Council, asking it to give some more suitable justification for it. On November 30 the Faculty Council met again and by two votes to two revoked its previous decision, which had been unanimous, doing away altogether with the teaching of church history in the Faculty: as an official reason it was stated that there was no point in teaching church history in this university, since "its philosophical aspect belongs to the history of philosophy and its religious aspect to the history of religions", which were already taught in the Faculty. (This justification bears a strange resemblance, one notices, to that given by Father Cavalli *à propos* of the teaching of Catholic doctrine in Spanish universities.) In an article in *Il Mondo* on

December 15, 1953, Luigi Salvemini also makes a violent protest: "The University Senate and the Faculty Council," he writes, "have laid down the rule that church history may only be taught in Italian universities by Catholics. They have treated it as a dogmatic-confessional subject, and have considered the Faculty of Letters, in this respect, as a Faculty of Catholic Theology. Still, neither of them has taken into account that, having established this, it is not enough for the professor of church history to be officially a Catholic. It must be ascertained that he is also an orthodox Catholic. The best method would, therefore, be to make him take an anti-modernist oath." But obviously Italian Catholicism is not yet in a sufficiently strong condition of "thesis" for the suggestion ironically made to it by the Italian historian to be put officially into action; it has to have recourse to the fairly confused and strange excuses of which you have read.

Teaching of philosophy

Not simply general history or church history, but philosophy as well, has been the object of confessional attacks in Italy. In *Rivista di Filosofia* (April, 1952) the following item appears: "The proposed philosophy syllabus for high schools — prepared by a so-called Educational Council, the legitimacy of which is somewhat obscure — has called forth a unanimous and lively protest. It is a clumsy attempt at abandonment, from confessional motives, of the freedom of philosophy teaching in the high schools, and it is hypocritically camouflaged by what are alleged to be educational needs. They would like to centre the whole historical development of philosophy on new writers (Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Bacon, Descartes, Galileo, Kant, Vico, Gioberti and Rosmini), limiting to these authors the choice of classics to be read, and laying down that the systematic conclusion which comes at the end of the course should be modelled on them. This project was immediately recognized for what it was, and evoked extremely lively, and completely justified, reactions, above all among philosophy teachers and *amateurs*, whose interests are more directly involved. In reply to these reactions, and especially to the intervention of

Benedetto Croce, the text of which appears below, an official representative of the Council made a declaration to the effect that the Council's intention was to draw up a purely suggestive list of philosophers, inasmuch as it was followed by 'etc.'. This 'etc.', according to this member of the Council, redeemed the whole thing and was meant to include a good part of ancient and modern, and all contemporary, philosophy. An 'etc.' of enormous value."

Benedetto Croce registered his protest in the following letter: "I am tormented by the thought that this plan for scholastic reform against which last year the all-Italian congress of philosophy teachers, of which I was a member, protested when it met at Pisa, is capable of taking on overnight the character of a *fait accompli* as a result of some legal decree or other expedient invented by those who have an interest in the matter. This project means the wholesale destruction of philosophy teaching in high schools. If you ask me why, the reason is that when a teacher is not free to choose the philosophers whose works will be studied and discussed, and certain compulsory ones are imposed on him by the syllabus, he has no opportunity of giving any serious teaching. In the syllabus which has been announced there is no mention, for instance, of Spinoza, Leibniz, Hegel or other renowned philosophers, but rather one finds Gioberti and Rosmini (Catholics), one known as an imaginative rhetorician, and the other, Rosmini, who has had more scientific background, completely immune to the influence of history and politics, which are an essential part of modern thought. If this project sought after by the reformers is realized, the teaching of philosophy in high schools will become a despicable thing, a public laughing stock. And philosophy, strangled by the state, will be pursued outside the school, and will be a continual reproach to this false and servile philosophy."

Reactions to cultural absolutism

These manifestations of cultural absolutism, as well as the political pressure exerted officially or secretly on Italian life by the Vatican and the hierarchy, do not fail to provoke a reaction in that section of public opinion which is still attached in the

realm of ideals to the liberal tradition of *Risorgimento* : some of them have already appeared in the course of the report we have given. Organizations like the Association for Cultural Freedom, and reviews like *Il Ponte* or *Il Mondo* do not fail regularly to denounce violations of cultural freedom, and that not merely from a liberal and lay position which might be one of mere indifference : we have the impression that these liberal laymen, and along with them a number of sincere Catholics like Arturo Carlo Jemolo, have a lively awareness that the shadiness of these manoeuvres and the ill-concealed abandonment of freedom of thought are not only a violation of human freedom, but also a watering-down and betrayal of the deepest values of Christianity of which, despite the secularization of our culture, our contemporaries are still aware, and which live in freedom on the other side of the often too narrow frontiers of ecclesiastical discipline and obedience.

Confessionalism and truth

So, if a conclusion is to be drawn from this account of Catholic confessionalism as it is related to academic and cultural freedom, we cannot refrain from emphasizing once more the complete absurdity, both theologically and historically — of a position of principle as stated by the Jesuit Father Cavalli, and as in fact implemented in the cases we have seen. It is inadmissible for a Christian Church, which lays claim today on the world stage to being a bulwark of all democratic and human liberties, to make simultaneously such an open denial of the religious and Christian freedom which is the very basis of all human liberties. It is not possible in the name of truth to profess and practise a doctrine of "double truth", thus opening the doors of the Church to the most baneful and dangerous social and spiritual influences which threaten to sully Christianity and to cast out from within it ever-increasing masses of mankind. Thus *this* confessionalism, and in our opinion *all* confessionalism, can only compromise the truth itself. We believe in freedom, not as an abstract idea, but because we believe that divine truth is free, and active among men.

The Belgian Conflict

The Free University of Brussels and the Roman Catholic University of Louvain

PIERRE MAHILLON

Belgium possesses four universities ¹ and a number of institutions of higher education. Almost half of the student body is to be found in Roman Catholic faculties, and about a fifth in the Free University of Brussels. This demonstrates the importance of private higher education, which, moreover, has been empowered since 1876 to grant diplomas on an equal footing with state institutions.

The University of Louvain is the successor of the *Studium Generale* established in 1426 by Pope Martin V at the request of Jean IV, Duke of Brabant, of the House of Burgundy, a century and a half before any other university in the Low Countries. It was not long before the original university developed into a seat of culture, the fame of which spread throughout the whole of Europe. It was visited by Erasmus and the geographer Mercator taught there. Its theologians turned it into a "bulwark of orthodoxy", opposed to Protestantism; later on it was involved in the last backwash of Jansenism. However, it underwent a prolonged period of decadence when it was closed, as a result of the French Revolution, in 1797. It reappeared as a state institution under the régime of union with Holland (1814-1830); Liège and Ghent likewise date from this period. Its re-establishment as a Roman Catholic university was decreed by the bishops in 1834 at the dawn of Belgian independence.

¹ In order of their importance according to the number of students: Louvain, Brussels, Liège and Ghent. The first has French and Flemish sections; the latter underwent increasing influence on the Flemish side following on the first world war. It is a familiar fact that Flemish, which is spoken in the northern half of the country, is not much more different from Dutch than American is from English. The College of Europe was founded in Bruges in 1950.

The counterstroke made by Free Masonry and the Voltairian bourgeoisie came immediately. But before analysing a conflict which has gone on up till our own day, it is fitting to sketch in the background.

Historical background

Belgium, which is an ancient nation but a young state, was founded by the union of the Roman Catholic and liberal opposition against William of the Netherlands, the last of the "Enlightened Despots". The Roman Catholics, drawn in by the formula, "A free Church in a free state", and the liberals, disposed to a conditional acceptance of the Christian heritage, succeeded in achieving a *modus vivendi* which, on the whole, has met with continuing acceptance. That is not to say that it has had no equivocal characteristics. We are all acquainted with the Roman doctrine of thesis and hypothesis, in accordance with which it is permissible to adopt a policy of withdrawal, patience and compromise when circumstances are not congenial to the wholesale application of the principles of the Church; freedom of conscience belongs to the domain of the hypothesis. As far as the anti-clericals were concerned, they would not accept pluralism except as a transitional condition; if some of them restricted themselves to fighting against spiritual coercion, others conceived religion as inevitably blocking the emancipation of man, which finally could not brook toleration; some arguments on the social side will come later.

The agreement from which the new state was born prevented civil conflict and those failures in concord which, in times of crisis, can bring about the destruction of a nation¹. Neither witch-hunting nor deep and lasting attacks on fundamental liberties, but alarms and sometimes very lively exchanges; both sides feel themselves in collision at the point of essential values.

* * *

¹ At the climax of the crisis over the royal house which, *grosso modo*, brought clericals and anti-clericals into opposition, the adversaries were deeply relieved that they did not have to come to blows (August, 1950).

The two great universities of the country reflect this antagonism and provide it with its ideological substance. They resort but rarely to open confrontation or to personal contact, apart from strictly scientific meetings. In 1941, the University of Brussels cancelled all courses rather than accept certain demands made by the nazis ; the neighbouring university opened its doors to the students ; the *rapprochement* which resulted has left definite but limited traces.

One would need to have done more than a Roman Catholic course in Natural Law in order to venture to paint a balanced picture of two widely differing mentalities. But the very universality of Roman Catholicism will allow the reader to fill in the gaps in this *exposé*. In Belgium, as in other countries, Roman Catholic higher education has adapted itself to the discoveries of modern science. Without holding a position in the forefront of Roman Catholic thought ¹, Louvain does not impose conformity on the independent minds of the professorial staff, among whom are Canon Leclercq, the sociologist, the philosopher De Waelhens, and the criminologist Etienne de Greef.

Libre examen in the Free University

The position of the Free University of Brussels is more unusual ; it even seems to have no foreign equivalent. The adjective "free" designates not only its independence *vis-à-vis* the state (which, though led to subsidize private higher education, still requires no other undertaking than that the programs of the main disciplines should correspond with certain norms which are laid down officially) ; it also indicates a philosophical orientation, a conception of truth, a will towards emancipation

¹ Even though a protest was voiced there against the dogma of the Assumption of Mary, and an ecumenical group of theological students on several occasions invited members of the Reformed Church to speak about Protestant viewpoints, the Protestant churches in Belgium and the World's Student Christian Federation. Dr. W. A. Visser 't Hooft was recently received very cordially by the Faculty of Theology.

Let us recall two facts which bear witness to the importance of Louvain in the Roman Catholic world. The Neo-Thomist Movement had its source there, under the stimulus of the future Cardinal Mercier ; and an inquiry carried out among the students of the Belgian Roman Catholic university preceded the pontifical condemnation of Maurras and *Action française*, the instrument of "integral nationalism".

which, paradoxically, is sometimes accompanied by fairly stringent prohibitions. It is indeed a fact that, in a Roman Catholic country, the opponents of the traditional doctrine still embrace modes of thinking which might be considered as being rejected along with this thinking itself; if we may paraphrase an English proverb, one might be tempted to say that they change the baby, but not the bath water. However, if some are satisfied with a fairly crude anti-dogmatism, others do not fail to recognize the reef on which they might founder. It is for this reason that the definition of the *libre examen*¹ presents itself as a *quaestio perpetua*. The university has limited itself up till now to referring to the principle which is its *raison d'être*; its founders gave it a single watchword: *scientia vincere tenebras* (conquer darkness by science); this is a basis which, as we shall see, is no longer accepted without significant correctives.

But periodically the professors apply themselves to rethinking the problem, while the students' associations for their part keep watch to see that the intellectual weapons which are their heritage are not blunted. The aim the students adopt is quite simple: to set up a membership clause which cannot be signed by the numerous Roman Catholic students enrolled at the university in Brussels, generally for reasons of convenience; should the occasion arise, it may equally be a matter of getting rid of fascists and other adherents of systems based fundamentally on the denial of human freedom². The idea is therefore that the formula varies according to the real or presumed evasive skill of the students whose pressure group activity is feared. Just before the war it was enough to be willing to seek truth through science without any *arrière-pensée* of a political or religious kind. The current text is more detailed, and the issue is that of refusal of all revealed truth. One faculty group had

¹ The right to think freely, a right which it is rather difficult to formulate in terms of obligation. The professors' assistants are free to act in accordance with their own interpretation of the undertaking to reject "authoritarian arguments in philosophical, moral and political thinking".

² Theoretically the communists could not come within the purview of such a bar since, at least in the long view, they are seeking the liberation of man. The pro-Soviet students were momentarily excluded from the semi-official "*libre examen*" group following on Russian aggression in Finland; their unconditional surrender to Stalinist directives was considered at the time incompatible with a doctrine based upon liberty.

added to it a questionnaire for the purpose of making an inquiry ; but protests against this "McCarthyist" method were raised in the ranks of the very students who were supporters of the *libre examen*.

A method, not a system

The university authorities and the professorial staff are bent on preserving for the students the greatest margin of latitude in setting up guiding lines for action. That does not mean, however, that they do not make an effort to give direction to their thinking and to raise controversy to a higher level. It would be an oversimplification to say that for some *libre examen* is confused in practice with the rejection of the Roman system, that for others it brings about the abandonment of the Judæo-Christian message, and that for yet others it implies the negation of all concepts of transcendence. In fact, the official protagonists of the principle of *libre examen* tend to attach less importance to the faith one accepts than to the process which leads to it ; it is obviously necessary for the doctrine one espouses not of itself to exclude *libre examen*. Accordingly, this principle is a method, and not a system ; it must not be confused with the conclusions — which are always, moreover, provisional, and subject to revision — to which its practice leads. What are the criteria which make an idea compatible with *libre examen* ? They have varied throughout history, but at the present moment representatives of all the dominant schools of the past are to be found ¹.

As was pointed out during an inaugural address in 1949 by M. Chaïm Perelman, Professor of Philosophy, the founders of the Free University appealed to "ideals of rationalism, even spiritualist rationalism" ². The Enlightenment brought about

¹ Thus Professor van Kolken wrote recently : "Every man may cherish a great hope, but, by the very principle of *libre examen*, he cannot lay claim to realize it by an act of faith. However small the part he reserves for the supernatural and revelation, it is enough to shut him out completely from the ranks of the adherents of *libre examen*. (In *Histoire des universités belges*, Brussels, 1953, p. 26.) But he admits "the hypothesis of God".

² *Le libre examen hier et aujourd'hui. Les cahiers du Libre examen, série XIV; no. 7.*

This rationalism sometimes went hand in hand with a sort of religion of nature which was exacting and lofty, described by the late lamented Professor Cammaerts in his autobiography. (*The Flower of Grass*. Cresset Press, London, 1944.)

by the exercise of philosophical thought freed from the yoke of tradition had to allow man to discover universal laws. The subjective nature of rational evidence led increasing numbers of thinkers to turn to positivism, which won the day towards the end of the nineteenth century. The experimental method overtook pure reflection. But it was, none the less, a mixture of rationalism and scientism which prevailed on the eve of the first world war. In certain respects an apparently wholesome anti-clericalism had veiled the necessity for an overhaul, which had already taken place in other countries ¹. It was the regular thing, barely any time ago, to consider any value judgment impossible, on account of its lack of any scientific basis; to conceive musical emotion as a phenomenon which was, unhappily, incapable of classification; in short, to assert that only scientific experience, that is to say, experience susceptible of control by reason and, in principle, of repetition at will, could bring man closer to the knowledge of truth.

Science and scientism

Modern science, since Galileo, has expelled theology from certain domains into which it had ventured in order, after a fashion, to fill a vacuum. On the other hand, the contrary nature of subsequent events, the indeterminist direction taken by science, the excesses of theories which had left behind their humanist bases ², resulted in this "rather grisly morning-after" of which Aldous Huxley speaks ³. M. Perelman is correct in his observation that the bankruptcy of science may not be announced on these grounds. "In reality," he says, "there is a misapprehension, because those who talk about the bankruptcy of science only bring forward arguments against scientism, that is to say, against the claim to legislate for all human problems by scientific methods. In fact, one speaks of the bankruptcy of

¹ The relative isolation of the Belgian scene is shown by the poor following found there for existentialism. It should be noted that the political and social continuity which was barely disturbed by the second world war, did not create an atmosphere in which theories of rupture could flourish.

² How can one condemn the experiments of nazi doctors without calling in extra-scientific notions? The same goes for certain applications of the discoveries of nuclear science.

³ *Ends and Means*, p. 268.

science according to the degree to which science proceeds beyond the limits of the properly scientific domain and seeks to find scientific solutions to social, political and other problems." Today, as hitherto, the University of Brussels takes upon itself the task of giving a moral as well as a scientific training. But where are principles for action to be found if science pronounces only on what is? The rejection of all arguments based on authority does not give exemption from the task of choosing a postulate. The intangible foundation of the *libre examen* remains "faith in man as one endowed with the means of knowing". This *a priori* is the root of the formula put forward by M. Perelman: "Doubt, decide, convince", that is, question ready-made truths and adopt a position as a free and responsible man; convince other men of what one believes to be true.

By this route one arrives at major questions, "What is man?", "What is freedom?", "What is truth?", to which must be added, "What is progress?", a question raised by a recent controversy¹. In upholding the view that man must be conceived as a moral end which is "not deduced but invented", a young woman secondary school teacher had made appeal to the concept of transcendence and to "a relativist and non-dogmatic pluralism". Her opponent brought against her the absolute of the Darwinian theory of progress, to which she retorted that science must be differentiated from the philosophical interpretations which it calls forth, and that the fact of progress has not been demonstrated. She had on the other hand specified that "the essential characteristic of the highest values is that they appear precarious and even contradictory, and their survival depends on their remaining so". It seems in fact difficult to reconcile the absolute affirmation of human freedom and the teaching of a doctrine which could not be discussed².

¹ Cf. "*A propos de la neutralité*", by M^{lle} Marthe Van de Meulebroeke, and in addition her reply to the criticisms of M. Arnould Clausse (*Morale et enseignement*, Nos. 5, 7 and 8).

² May we recommend the works of M. Eugène Dupréel, honorary professor at the Free University, to those who would like to carry further a study of the moral thought of the *libre examen* position.

Protestantism and Roman Catholicism

It would be wrong for a Christian, especially if he is loyal to the Reformation, to forget that, in a certain sense, only the spirit of man knows the things of a man (I Cor. 2 : 11). He must be grateful to those who have struggled against prejudices, extended the limits of human knowledge, and defended a life-giving ideal, and consider their methods attentively. He knows, however, what he cannot help knowing concerning the human condition, the meaning of life and history, and the truth of the Gospel, for this is the culmination of a process of long and difficult advance. A Protestant does not believe all that dogmatically, for dogma, the reasoned and secondary expression of faith, is for him no more than a point of reference. Kierkegaard and Barth have taught him anew to free himself from religious needs which, in a famous phrase, lead us to make God in our own image, concealing Jesus Christ. He is not a man bowed under the weight of the past, but the man of here and now. The precariousness of the highest earthly values does not move him to derision, but to a hope which is in no sense a hiding place.

In many respects Roman Catholicism is more comprehensible to its direct adversaries than the Reformed faith. It takes up its stand in fact on the ground of reason in order to demonstrate, almost completely, spiritual values. Even in the opinion of some unbelievers it seems to offer a sort of intellectual security which would be the reward of those who are content with a simple change of label¹. Belgian Protestantism is numerically too insignificant to constitute a noteworthy and permanent factor in the country's life (it is only one half of one per cent of the entire population). It succeeds too rarely in making known the thought and attitudes of the Reformation. In the conflict between Brussels and Louvain, Protestantism is simply not

¹ During a discussion in the *libre examen* group, there was cast up at a Protestant speaker the dangerous perplexity in which his fellow Protestants would find themselves if they were deprived of all binding doctrine. This is an instinctive but characteristic reaction. Would this not be the place to recall the statement of W. A. Visser 't Hooft that a Christian has the same problems as any other man — and a few more into the bargain! (Quoted from memory.)

taken into account ; it is hard to fit it into a category without its originality standing out in bold relief.

The professorial staff of the Free University has continually had Protestant members ¹ (not to mention Jews), some of them nominal, others convinced. It even happened that one of their number, Unitarian in sympathy, was the Chairman of the Administrative Council.

The Protestant students, unlike the Roman Catholics, can organize themselves as they will and invite friends to their meetings ². They do not always benefit from the facilities granted to groups which have official recognition. It rests with them to think out their faith within an institution which was clearly not set up to provide them with a hot-house, but where sincere witness is met with respect.

Beyond a certain limit, what worth is there in the criteria and distinctions made by men ? I do not mean by that that in the end everything meets and mingles. But it does seem to me that systems give way to paradox when one least expects it. It is well known that Calvinism, despite basic principles which ought to paralyze the will, generates energy. Under the occupation, *libre examen* ran the risk of being destroyed by an improper transposition of scientific methods ; nothing would *prove* that nazism was wrong. The Free University of Brussels, like that of Leiden, was a centre of the Resistance. It was motivated by the love of *libre examen* and respect of man. This is a fact to which a Christian is not insensible, even if he persists in repeating, "To God alone be the glory".

¹ Among them are several of the founders of the "*Foyer de l'Ame*" which, at the end of the last century, sought to maintain a Christian outlook while at the same time deserting the Roman Catholic Church and adopting an anthropocentric position. It seems that this rather vague idealism no longer has attractive power for unbelievers in our difficult times.

² There has been a Student Christian Movement since 1937 and a *Groupe biblique universitaire* for several years past. Here is proof — if indeed any were needed — of Protestant diversity.

Academic Freedom in the United States

PAUL LEHMANN

Academic freedom in the United States has become, at the very least, controversial. At the worst, it is being steadily undermined. Whether or not academic freedom, in any authentic meaning of the phrase, will survive the present storm is, at this writing, problematical. Certainly, it would be too much to conclude that the battle is lost. There are important centres of resistance, voices of protest, and isolated victories to record against the pressures now mounting against freedom of thought and expression. In the main, however, academic groups, that is, teachers, administrations, boards of trustees, are divided in counsels and in procedures for dealing with an admittedly complex and shifting situation.

Conditions for academic freedom

Academic freedom has to do with the conditions fundamental to the pursuit of truth by the mind of man. They can be formulated in various ways. It may be more fruitful to think of academic freedom in terms of the conditions for it than to propose a formal definition of the phrase. The phrase, "academic freedom" denotes at least three conditions, indispensable to the pursuit of truth by the mind of man. The first of them is the responsibility for truth which grows out of the responsiveness of the human mind to the truth which it apprehends. The nature and history of human reflection seem to underline the point that there is an immediate openness between the human mind and the truth which is apprehended. The beginning of human reflection is the beginning of the awareness of this immediacy. And once the awareness has dawned, the responsibility for the truth thus apprehended, for its pursuit and clarification, no matter where it may lead, cannot be put to rest.

The second condition for academic freedom is a negative corollary of the first. The response to, and the responsibility

for, truth cannot be limited from without. The right of free inquiry is an unabridged right, with one important exception. The exception is the limitation imposed upon the response to truth by the responsibility inherent in the response itself. This means that neither state, nor church, nor public opinion, nor organized vested interest can determine the conditions or the limits within which the right of free inquiry is to be exercised. None of these "powers" can be used to break the inherent self-limitation involved in the exercise of the right of free inquiry. Truth is inherently constructive, not destructive, creative not stultifying, liberating not enslaving, critical not parochial. The human reason is, of course, never as uncorrupted by self-interest as the pursuit of truth requires. But the remedy for this defection is not a purge from outside, and under "non-academic" auspices. The remedy is an inner purification through a heightened sensitivity to the concourse between the human mind and the truth which it seeks and apprehends. Whether this heightened sensitivity can be achieved without a religious commitment may be doubted. This is what Jesus meant by his declaration that, "if you continue in my word, you are truly my disciples, and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free" (John 8: 32). But even without such a commitment, there is no alternative to the self-limitation involved in academic freedom except the destruction of that freedom altogether. If Thomas Jefferson's conviction that truth is certain to triumph over error in an uninhibited concourse of ideas includes an element of unwarranted optimism, his oath against tyranny is certainly an accurately measured protest against any surrogate for the self-limitation of intellectual freedom. "I have sworn upon the altar of God," Jefferson declared, "eternal hostility to every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

The third condition of academic freedom is suggested by the history of the phrase itself. What underlies the phrase is the ethos and decorum of the Academy in ancient Greece. Here was a community of teachers and learners, drawn together by their common love of wisdom, and sensitive above all things to the conviction that the pursuit of wisdom was the highest human dignity and human service. The tradition of the Academy is being perpetuated by the colleges and universities in every

land. Academic freedom is the hallmark of a community of scholars and is committed to this community as a privilege and a trust. The recognition of the right of the academic community to exercise the trust and privilege committed to it, is as intrinsic to academic freedom as the recognition of the right of free inquiry. When a society, for *any* reason, finds it necessary to intrude upon this right, something more than the protection of the security of that society is at stake. Social self-protection has taken a wrong turn, and in the direction of social dissolution. Totalitarianism may hold a society together for a very long time. But politics in the West from Augustus to Malenkov significantly underlines the point that the instinctive aversion of totalitarianism for academic freedom marks the advance of dissolution over security in a society.

Although the present discussion is chiefly concerned with what is going on in the United States, it is relevant briefly to suggest these theoretical considerations, because the problems raised by what is happening arise from a confusion about, or a surrender of, the basic conditions without which there can be no academic freedom in any authentic sense of the phrase. The conditions of academic freedom apply to all educational levels, elementary, secondary, undergraduate and graduate. But it is at the college and university level that the current controversy in the United States can be most readily understood, and will be perhaps of most direct interest to readers of *The Student World*.

Precedents in the past

It is easy for Americans to forget, and much easier for people abroad not to remember, that the current controversy over academic freedom is not entirely new in the United States. There have always been school boards exercising a kind of local censorship over the contents of text-books used by pupils in elementary and secondary schools, as well as assorted pressures upon teachers to conform. A well-known college at which I once taught still carried among its ghostly memories the dismissal of a teacher who found it necessary during the first world war to embark upon Henry Ford's famous "Peace Ship".

The abridgement of free speech and free assembly outside the university community also has precedents running as far back as the witches of seventeenth-century Salem in Massachusetts. Indeed, there have been enough of these precedents in our national history to make it possible for social scientists to urge that there really is no threat to academic freedom in the United States today, since no encroachment upon freedom of thought and teaching has been made since the end of the second world war which could not be paralleled by some previous situation. I shall never forget the remark that "there is no abridgement of academic freedom today; the trouble is that somehow people don't speak as freely as they could". And perhaps even more memorable than the remark was the fact that it was made by a widely and highly regarded professor of politics at a meeting sponsored by the graduate club of his own department in one of our leading universities. I was comforted by the thought that the political scientists appeared to have taken over from the theologians their often too well-played role as purveyors of illusions. But it was cold comfort indeed.

"Cold civil war"

The present account of academic freedom in the United States thus cannot presuppose agreement on the most general aspect of the situation even within the academic community. Nevertheless, it may be said that there is a considerable consensus among men of dispassionate mind and passionate heart, both in academic and in public life, that academic freedom is in trouble. Mr. Elmer Davis, one of the noblest and ablest of such men, director of the Office of War Information from 1942-45, and since 1945 the top news analyst for the American Broadcasting Company, has just published a book in which he states the issue in the sharpest possible focus. "This nation was conceived in liberty and dedicated to the principle — among others — that honest men may honestly disagree; that if they say what they think, a majority of the people will be able to distinguish truth from error; that in the competition in the market place of ideals, the sounder ideas will in the long run win out. For almost four years past we have been engaged

in a cold civil war — it is nothing less — testing whether any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.”¹

In this “cold civil war”, the score of victories and defeats for academic freedom is disproportionately in favour of defeat. Whether the losses are fatal or merely preliminary retreats owing to confusion and disorganization of resistance, it is too early to say. What is not too early to say is that there have been notable victories, which have dulled the edge of the attack and which could mean the turning of the tide of battle, if the academic community in particular, and the public in general, will rally to articulate and to defend the fundamental conditions without which academic freedom cannot survive.

Victories

Some two or three years ago, the University of California significantly defeated an attempt by the Board of Regents of the university to compel faculty members to take a so-called “anti-communist” oath, in addition to the loyalty oath already required of state employees by the Constitution of the State of California. Vigorous and organized faculty resistance, together with numerous prominent faculty resignations, brought about a withdrawal of the regulation of the Regents. In a remarkable gesture of the solidarity of the academic community, the University of Chicago offered immediate appointment to the members of the faculty of the University of California who had resigned or were threatened with dismissal. More recently, Harvard University has steadfastly and without fanfare refused to be intimidated into dismissing a faculty member accused by a congressional committee. Other colleges could be mentioned, whose presidents and trustees have either firmly resisted local pressures upon teachers and text-books from super-patriotic groups, or have placed legal counsel at the disposal of faculty members under congressional subpoena. A touching episode at a prominent New England college indicates the degree to which residual strength on behalf of the freedom to teach and to learn still undergirds college and university circles. Word

¹ *But We Were Born Free*. The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., Indianapolis, 1954, p. 114.

spread around the campus that a certain faculty member was to appear on a certain day before a congressional committee. It happened that, on the previous day, this faculty member was scheduled to lead the service in the college chapel. At the service that morning, the students attended *en masse* in silent tribute of respect and support. The chapel has never been so crowded in recent memory.

Defeats

On the other hand, in February, 1953, the newspaper of another prominent university published an editorial commenting on its efforts to gather faculty opinion on questions of academic freedom. "The results," says the editorial, "have been, to put it bluntly, shocking. . . . The significant fact is that of those interviewed, several refused to answer any of the questions, some showed extreme reluctance, and about half were careful to make sure their views would not be associated with their names in print. . . . The fear of being smeared or misunderstood extends to matters only remotely connected with communism itself." And what is true of faculties is true also of students. Student workers report a growing reluctance on the part of students to explore controversial issues, engage in any common effort to ameliorate or correct social abuses, and even to seek information about what is going on. On another campus the United Religious Council voted its annual "Brotherhood Award" to Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, only to be drawn under direct and indirect pressure from the university administration into a protracted reconsideration of the decision, and finally to vote the award to someone else. Perhaps the nadir of this "time of troubles" for academic freedom in the United States was reached through the discovery, occasioned by the dismissal of a faculty member, that a member of the student body on that campus had actually been in the employ of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This device is generally regarded as of no great importance at the moment. But its potential danger to academic freedom is scarcely to be underestimated.

Under these circumstances, it is disquieting to observe that college and university administrations, as well as faculties,

have taken up defensive positions. This is understandable enough because the problems raised by the "cold civil war" for academic freedom are complex and acute. But this defensiveness does give ground to the enemies of academic freedom, and poses the question whether a bolder kind of leadership from within the academic community is not both possible and urgent.

Problems

The difficulties must be understood, however, if the situation in the United States is to be correctly interpreted and evaluated. Some of these difficulties may be indicated in this way. There are problems of academic freedom which concern the academic community as distinct from the social and political community. And there are problems of academic freedom which concern the academic community as part of the social and political community.

In connection with the first group of problems, there are at least two issues which are being vigorously debated. One of these has to do with the question how far the academic community can and ought to insist upon its distinctive place and tradition within the social and political community. Where is the boundary between the exercise of the freedom of research and the freedom of teaching and the responsibility of the social and political community for the ordering of the common life? No member of the academic community is prepared to affirm that the academic community has no responsibility to the larger community. But can one insist upon the conditions for academic freedom mentioned at the outset of this account, without falling into the position that the academic community is its own law? The other issue related to the academic community as distinct from the social and political community concerns the boundary between teaching and propaganda. Can the teacher in the exercise of the freedom of research and teaching avoid the kind of passion for the truth which makes it important whether ideas are understood by the students as participants rather than as spectators? If one can avoid this kind of passion, are not research and teaching likely to be

reduced to statistics? And if one cannot avoid this kind of passion, or if one should not avoid it, does the teacher then become an instructor or an indoctrinator? This problem is not so acute where ideas are not controversial. But where they are controversial, does the teacher become a propagandist because ideas make a difference to him? Obscurity on this point, and the desire to avoid propaganda, have tended to turn teachers in the United States away from the risks of the intellectual adventure, as the college newspaper editorial suggested.

Freedom and security

In connection with the second group of problems, there are at least two issues which may be mentioned, and which are being vigorously debated. These have to do with the fact that the academic community is a part of the social and political community, and has been drawn into the tension between freedom and security in which that larger community is currently involved. One of these issues is the vexing problem how freedom of any kind, including academic freedom, can be preserved in the face of the mounting menace of totalitarianism. The particular academic form of this problem is whether a teacher, who is either a theoretical or a practising communist of any variety, should be or can be a member of a college or university faculty. If the answer to this question is affirmative, has not the academic community opened its gates to a Trojan Horse of an incipient and particularly virulent dogmatism which is the very antithesis of intellectual freedom? If the answer is negative, how can a college or university administration adopt a policy of "political dismissal" and hold the line, particularly under the increasing pressure of public hysteria and fear? There is a deadly concreteness about this issue every time a faculty member is subpoenaed by a congressional committee. The "fifth amendment" controversy now raging in the social and political community is really acute for the academic community, because of a genuine perplexity over the boundary between intellectual freedom and the organized dogmatism of totalitarianism. Shall the college and university administrations sustain or suspend the Bill of Rights of the

American Constitution? Can one really take the melancholy position, not infrequently adopted by administrations, that to stand by teachers who plead either the first or the fifth amendment is bad public relations? Or does the wisdom of experience not rather point to the fact, so graphically phrased by Mr. Norman Thomas, that "if you burn down the barn to get rid of the rats, the rats usually escape; it is the horses that perish"?

The other, and of course the most fundamental, issue arising from the involvement of the academic community as part of the social and political community, is whether the current threats against academic freedom are part of a wider attack upon the freedom of the mind. "I have received thousands of letters from people ... in recent years," writes Mr. Elmer Davis, "and they do not seem interested in Russia at all: what they hate and fear is their own neighbours who try to think. In the name of anti-communism they try to strike down the freedom of the mind, which above all things differentiates us from the communists; in the name of Americanism they try to suppress the right to think what you like and say what you think, in the evident conviction ... that the principles on which this Republic was founded and has been operated will not bear examination. ... There is a hazard in the freedom of the mind, ... as in any freedom. In trying to think right you run the risk of thinking wrong. But there is no hazard at all, no uncertainty in letting somebody else tell you what to think; that is sheer damnation."¹ If Mr. Davis is correct, this is what is happening in the United States. Academic freedom is endangered not because of its own doing but because the community at large is being tempted to do it in.

Lack of consensus and courage

But the academic community itself is not sufficiently persuaded that this is the heart of the matter. There is a lack of adequate consensus and adequate courage of mind to stand resolutely upon the fundamental conditions without which academic freedom is deprived of authentic meaning. Instead,

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 226, 113.

the tendency among college and university administrations and faculties has been, with conspicuous exceptions, to give ground and to allow the enemy to set the terms of the debate. The Association of American Colleges and Universities and, to a lesser degree, the American Association of University Professors, have issued statements which may be regarded as representative of the academic community and which run somewhat like this: totalitarianism is an ominous threat to the Western cultural tradition and to all the freedoms which are the fruit of this tradition. The world-wide communist movement is the aggressive form of this totalitarianism today. The United States is at once the principal target of the aggressive designs of communism for world domination and the principal bulwark of the resistance of the free world. The academic community recognizes and supports the social and political community in the United States to safeguard the security of the United States. The academic community claims no immunities and no special privileges in the larger community. The academic community not only does not challenge but welcomes the efforts of the United States Congress through its investigating committees to watch over the security of the nation. Communists are outside the boundaries of academic freedom and the academic community is prepared to cooperate with government in the elimination of communists from colleges and universities. As a mark of its good faith, the academic community is prepared to rethink the whole question of the nature and the limits of academic freedom.

A plan of action

Suppose, however, that the academic community were prepared to put the case exactly the other way around! Suppose bold and uncompromising affirmation were given to the fundamental conditions of academic freedom. And suppose it were insisted that the attempt of society to suppress this freedom was a sign that the first step towards a totalitarian order had been taken. Suppose it were boldly underlined that totalitarianism thrives upon social confusion and economic dislocation and injustice. Where these are absent, totalitarian-

ism cannot take root. Former President Conant of Harvard University is nearer the actual foundations of the security of the nation than the "wild men" of the United States Congress. "It would be a sad day for the United States," Conant declared, "if the tradition of dissent were driven out of its universities. For it is the freedom to disagree, to quarrel with authority on intellectual matters, to think otherwise, that has made this nation what it is. Our industrial society was pioneered by men who were dissenters. The global struggle with communism turns on this very point." If President Conant is right, so too is Judge Learned Hand, whose famous speech to the Board of Regents of the State of New York declared that "risk for risk, for myself I had rather take my chance that some traitors will escape detection than spread abroad a spirit of general suspicion and distrust, which accepts rumour and gossip in place of undismayed and unintimidated inquiry. . . . Of this I am sure — if we are to escape, we must not yield a foot upon demanding a fair field, and an honest race, to all ideas."

To take *this* line would seem to demonstrate the service of the academic community to the social and political community, not by defensive protestation but by faith and action on the offensive. Instead of spending time in the invention of such dubious subtleties as "heresy but not conspiracy", or "dissent but not disruption", the free minds of free men, inspired by the conviction that "dissent is not treason" and that this is no time to traffic with the enemy in any way whatever, can rise effectively to the urgency of the hour. There is still time and viability in American society to let that kind of freedom ring! "What makes western civilization worth saving," says Mr. Davis, "is the freedom of the mind . . . If we have not the courage to defend that faith, it won't matter much whether we are saved or not."¹

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 228.

Academic Freedom in a Communist Society¹

The owl of Minerva, says Hegel, takes wing only as the darkness descends. It is only when historical phenomena have grown old that we can understand the reasons behind their growth, and investigate its laws.

But Karl Marx not only seeks to understand aging phenomena after the event : he desires to shape something new. He seeks to do this in accordance with the laws which, by virtue of his dialectical method, he has conceived to be those of society's growth. That is to say, he desires his work to have value in terms of scientific knowledge. His teaching lays claim to being a science.

But this science is not the product of university research, and it is not pursued in universities. Its source and its home are, and remain, the communist party. The latter, for its part, prescribes that the universities shall carry on research in the whole range of disciplines, and that this research shall be completely conditioned by the basic scientific principles laid down by the communist ideology. The communist party is, as it were, the proprietor of genuine science ; just as the Roman Church, by analogy, is the proprietor of the revelation of God. It is not by chance that the relationship of a ruling church to unfettered science resembles feature by feature the relationship of the communist ideology and party to the various individual sciences. But at the same time the medieval university mostly possessed a greater measure of freedom, because those engaged scientifically in teaching and research were themselves bound by this teaching and for the most part adhered to it in the freedom of a common belief. If they did not, they had to reckon with the possibility of being liquidated. As communist power relationships have their integrating centre in the com-

¹ For obvious reasons, the author of this article has preferred to remain anonymous.

munist ideology, communism cannot abide any failure to toe the line. For the Roman Church the way is still open to trust that God can preserve the Church, and truth as well, against error. The communist world has to preserve itself. Anyone who permits an error is guilty of negligence. Negligence must be punished. To be alert is one of the main tasks of the party; self-criticism saves the deviators; and, which is more important, rescues at the same time the foundations of communist society.

Within the limits of this dogmatic tie some freedom is possible, as, too, in the Roman Church there has indeed been some freedom for science. But, fundamentally, the communist university is itself no longer a university. It is a cluster of technical colleges. Truth is always known already. In social science and contemporary history it is simply taught, and not properly investigated. The writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin hold a similar place to that of the Bible in the Christian churches. One of the basic Marxist sciences is the exegesis and application of these writings. The position occupied by social science and the teaching of the communist ideology is similar to that which used to be held in the university by theology and philosophy.

Marxist ideology

The other disciplines only have purpose in giving general direction and providing technical equipment. At this point the ruling position is held by what Western philosophy calls positivism. If Marxist philosophy has its source in the idealism of Hegel and the materialism of Feuerbach, a positivism loosed from the compulsion of truth holds sway in the various individual sciences. From A to Z the communist ideology draws its life from the philosophical tradition of the nineteenth century, and therein has the same spiritual and intellectual roots as the break-up of the West, which took place in the nineteenth century. The atomization of the university into a cluster of specialist disciplines in specialized colleges, the disintegration of philosophy and theology, the transformation of the professor who was a guardian of truth into a mere specialist (if possible in a field where there is a scarcity of personnel), the transition,

by way of materialism, from idealism to nihilism — and all that bound up with the struggle for power rather than justice — that is the attitude and heritage of the nineteenth century. This attitude is required with violence from the Russian people; in the great success of the civilizing work of the communist regime in overcoming the backwardness of Russian civilization lies the pathos of the events inside Russia. The historical laws recognized by Marxism seem correctly understood and correctly applied and through this their truth seems to be attested.

The Marxist doctrine of salvation brooks no doubt. The doubter is not only unscientific and stupid, but malicious and dangerous. At a certain moment not only one's opponent, but also the doubter, must be done away with. For the communist ideology alone gives a guarantee for life and the future. To the non-communist liberty is conceded only during a transition period. On the other hand, this ideology is the justification for every act of devotion, every sacrifice, indeed in a certain sense for every crime which may help to bring about the classless society. This is quite analogous to what one otherwise conceives of as Jesuit morality. And since here there is no compulsion to give an account to the living God Himself for one's actions, one is free to perform any and every deed which will be of service to the communist ideology. This ideology is the justification of everything which serves it.

So one is dealing here with a philosophy of formidable unity and compactness. Although its premises bear a particular historical stamp — that of rationalism — which, like some mystic panacea, has taken on utopian characteristics, this "science" in an impressive scholastic structure seems to have found the solution to all problems in a set of formulas.

To what end...?

To what end then have the great lonely figures of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as well as the men of our own time, suffering in their humanity, tormented themselves so fruitlessly? Could Nietzsche not have found satisfaction for his soul (or rather his philosophical need) in the dialectical method of communist knowledge and insight? Could not the

philosophers who wanted more than positivism have slaked their thirst for truth as communists? Could the churches, rather than entering into the plight of suffering and misused humanity, not have consoled it with hopes of a future social system in which cooperation would be the order of the day? Could not the thinkers who sought a responsible personal existence have found it in Moscow's materialistic idealism? Could not suffering individuals have gone into the collective, which was pregnant with the future? Even if success could not be called in yet as evidence, did the promise of it not speak for the future of this ideology? How many tormenting thoughts and pains of conscience, how much priestly compassion, philosophical questioning, and how many by-paths of error we could have saved ourselves . . . ! But, to be sure, these great figures, these suffering men in their human longing and pain, and the scientists who have done honest research and been real teachers, will not in reality have suffered, doubted and carried on their search wrongly and fruitlessly. To a large extent they have in this overtaken the insufficient intellectual foundations of the nineteenth century, which in communism is once more unleashing the whole impact of its gathered strength.

Freedom is a luxury

Both West and East are caught up in the irresistible advance of technical knowledge. Even man has become for them radically and psychologically predictable, and whatever can be predicted seems also susceptible to control. In the greatest contemporary technical powers, Russia and America, man the predictable can be created — and destroyed — in the retort of the technical age. Man has lost his mystery. The world has lost its mystery. In an ultimate sense there is no more freedom for this world or these men. Since the state has the care of the lives of men, and promises to exercise this responsibility as all-inclusively as possible, to put in a claim for personal freedom would be to ask too much of the state. This is valid at least until a perfect world can afford perfect freedom. In the transition period freedom is a luxury.

In this sense there cannot really be academic freedom either in communist countries. On the one hand, there exists

there in academic work a great *élan* motivated by technical passion, and, on the other, a disabling of free human activity. Every psychology and educational theory teaches that the growing man needs freedom to make mistakes, and that there is no mental and spiritual progress without genuine mental and spiritual right-about turns. But in states whose power is rooted in an ideology mistakes are dangerous. It is certainly not by chance that young people are precisely the ones who are subject to the most severe political penalties. On the other hand, young people profit from certain permanent revolutionary measures taken in their favour. In the household of communist society there are ever-repeated sacrifices which meet the society's need to be cleansed, and which can only be conceived as arbitrary by spirits which are free. These resemble the human sacrifices which in primeval times bought exemption from the wrath of the gods. Each one of these sacrifices finds its justification in the messianic goal of progress.

School for "counsellors"

But, contrary to all this, the original conception of the university was one of great freedom. The university always implied a critical countering of political power. At a university men afforded themselves the "luxury" of seeking truth and, in reverence for it, not simply identifying it with their own knowledge. A university was not a training ground for specialists whom worldly powers could appoint or replace at will, but a school for "counsellors" (of justice, of medicine, etc.) who — according to the fine scholarship of Rosenstock-Hüssy in his lecture on the nature of the university — gave counsel to the state on their own moral responsibility. At the universities there was a striving after truth. There characters were formed which, from within a moral bond, set limits to the mere lust for power. There men were taken seriously as beings who, for Christ's sake, were loved by God. And for that reason men could not be treated as material, any more than they could become mere objects. He who laid violent hands on men had to reckon with the anger of God ; the world was conceived as under the judgment of God and thereby preserved against license, but at the same time liberated to live in responsible

freedom. It was not by chance that the university, in Germany and in many other countries, made a place for the Reformation. At the university it was not merely a case of amassing material resources in a technically positivist way ; men were not simply informed about matters of fact ; they were educated there to live as men. There was confidence in the power of truth to renew. And therefore one took the risk of a dangerous freedom. The fabulous intellectual blossoming of the West had its roots in the hazards of freedom. It was, admittedly, not abstract freedom, but was theologically bound. With the loss of the theological bond the West lost its strength and the East its freedom.

Is there any hope ?

In communism lofty confidence in rationalism seems still undisturbed. It still seems that no-one is aware of how little "man the predictable" corresponds to real man. It still seems that no-one is aware of how much personal arbitrariness offends against organic mysteries. People still have great confidence in planning, although the plans have often enough had to be revised. It is still not realized that matter is not simply material for human arbitrariness, but itself the possessor of deep mysteries of meaning. Still with Hegel men regard world history as the history of the human mind, and have not found the promised interdependence of the history of the human mind and natural science. We are still ailing from the nineteenth century and are offering violent opposition only to the illness itself. We are still amputating where we could heal.

Is there any hope for academic freedom in communist countries ? Will the painful correctives which have been attempted here and there — by no means everywhere — in the West be discovered and permitted ? At this point it is difficult to give a diagnosis as we lack knowledge of the inner conditions in communist countries. The answer one gives to such a question can perhaps only be a "dogmatic", or theological, one.

Perhaps the reply could be something like this : the communist ideology tries to be watertight. The time-table of projected developments promises to run an undeviating course.

And yet it is clear that the time-table has, at many points, been upset not in the first place by the ideologists, but by circumstances themselves. Admittedly it requires great courage to take cognizance of these circumstances. It has required repeatedly compelling situations and favourable constellations in order to call forth the courage which faces realities, and to turn important pieces of knowledge to good account. And an ingredient of courage is the will to freedom and truth. The decisive factor is that the ideology has had again and again to give way to facts, and the time-table for its realization to be altered by the actual circumstances. In this way indestructible life and the indestructible mystery of reality have repeatedly held their own against human doctrine. If this were unbelievable, there would still, in the absence of belief, be signs that the world is ruled by God, and not by men. It does, moreover, correspond with the philosophy of Hegel, that caprice comes to grief against facts, and that the dialectical process is greater than the human understanding of it which, despite all, is subsequent to it. Possibly a limitless number of people will suffer shipwreck in their human, psychic and physical being as a result of the philosophical mistakes of those who identify their limited knowledge with truth itself. God, and the reality of His creation (repeatedly perverted by us men), will be able to assert themselves against us men, and liberty in God will shine out like a beacon to the ends of the earth. Even if only at the Judgment, what God rejects and what He blesses and brings to honour will be made clear. No-one who takes the risk of freedom in responsible awareness of facts is deserted by God. And that is the hope for communism as well. The communist university too (or the cluster of specialized colleges) lives under God's heaven and draws its life from the mysteries of a world which comes from the hands of God. That can be denied as "unscientific", but it remains none the less a fact.

A turning point ?

When will Marxist philosophy — against many of its premises — yield to this theological fact ? Does perhaps, as Rosenstock-Hüssy would like to believe in his book, *Europäische Revolutionen*, Stalin's essay on language betoken a turning

point in communist philosophy ? Does this essay make possible conversation between free partners from the most diverse eras ? Does it become again possible to believe that, by the encounter with truth, men can become in a most real sense fully men, and thus partners and brothers in no matter what century this encounter has taken place ? Are technical progress and the lamentable results of deified "development" finally being demythologized, or does the product of human civilization remain the worshipped object of all our desires ? Will man (as he was intended by God to be) win through to space to live in, freedom, substance and honour ? The real question to Marxism is a theological question. Under Marxism Russia has endeavoured to establish contact with the West in matters of civilization. It does not know as yet — in any case does not acknowledge officially — that still more is at stake. If Russia were to get a reformer who could speak to it the Word of God with power, it would, humanly speaking, have a mighty future. As long as Russia has only the communist ideology, it is very vulnerable, and, in an ultimate profound sense, barren. But who can believe that God and His Word will call a halt before the frontiers of this country and that the truth will not, here also, make free ? The West has forgotten this truth often enough. If communism were to yield to this truth, the West could be confronted with a grievous and difficult question, and it would become clear whether the West has misused its freedom or whether what it conceived in its freedom to be the truth really was the truth.

The University and Freedom of Education in the U.S.S.R.

VICTOR MALININ

The topic suggested by the editor of *The Student World* is very broad and could be the subject of an extensive study. In this article I shall merely express my personal opinion and views.

Everyone can study

"Everyone can study" — these words are not only a fine phrase but they truthfully reflect our life. One figure will suffice to illustrate this point: fifty-seven million people are studying in our country. This speaks volumes — anyone in our country who wishes to study encounters no restrictions of any kind. Compulsory, free, seven-year education for youth is now in force in the Soviet Union. Compulsory ten-year education is now being introduced in a number of the larger cities, and in the future it will be put into effect throughout the country.

After finishing seven grades, boys and girls continue their education in the senior grades of secondary schools or in technical secondary schools, upon graduation from which they can enter an institute or university. Any graduate of a secondary school, irrespective of his social origin, religious views, race or nationality, can enroll in a higher educational institution. Young people do not have to travel to the largest centres in order to enter a university or institute, since there is a higher educational institution in every more or less important town. Altogether there are now about nine hundred institutions of higher learning in the U.S.S.R., of which dozens have been opened in the last two years. The only requirement for entering a university or institute is passing successfully the entrance examination. There are no restrictions of any kind. It is natural,

therefore, that the total number of students in our country reaches one and a half million.

The student body is very diversified. It consists of representatives of different nationalities and different sections of the population. In our university, for example, you can find young people of more than sixty nationalities: Russians, Ukrainians, Georgians, Uzbeks and Kazakhs. There are also representatives of nationalities which prior to the October Revolution were totally illiterate and on the verge of extinction: Udmurtians, Chukchi, Nentsi, Mansi and Evenki. The doors of our institutions of higher learning are wide open to women. In our university there are approximately equal numbers of youths and girls among the students. In some departments, such as history and philology, the majority are girls. As for the social composition of Soviet students, it is highly diversified. It is difficult for me to say which are more numerous in our university — children of workers, peasants or intellectuals. Perhaps their numbers are about equal.

Material security

There is no question that material security plays a tremendous part in the life of students. In our country all students who satisfactorily pass their examinations at the end of the term receive state stipends. These comprise more than ninety per cent of all students. The amount of a student's stipend runs up to six hundred rubles a month. Moreover, students who receive excellent marks on all examinations get an addition of twenty-five per cent to the regular stipend. University postgraduates receive a stipend of from eight hundred to one thousand rubles a month. Each postgraduate is also given an allowance equalling a month's stipend for the purchase of books in his field. All postgraduate studies are free. If need be, a postgraduate has the right during the three-year term of studies to travel, at the expense of the respective institute, to any point in the Soviet Union in order to collect material for his dissertation. It should be noted that Soviet undergraduates and postgraduates get stipends not only during the term of studies, but also during the holidays, the period of practical training, and in case of illness.

The state extends a number of privileges to students. First, the tuition fee is small: it amounts to four hundred rubles a year in the capitals of the Union republics and three hundred in all other cities. Moreover, a considerable number of students are exempted from paying the tuition fees. Second, students have free use of libraries, laboratories and study facilities. Students, like all Soviet citizens, enjoy free medical care. The administration of an institution of higher learning takes care of the housing needs of the students. Each out-of-town student is accommodated in a hostel. The payment for a room in a hostel, linen and other services is very small — fifteen rubles a month.

The students have holidays twice a year. Many of them spend these at rest homes or sanatoria. Incidentally, these accommodations are given free of charge or at thirty per cent of the cost, the rest being covered by the trade union. Many universities and institutes have their own rest homes or sanatoria. Moscow University, for example, has its own rest homes in picturesque spots near Moscow and on the coast of the Riga Gulf, and a sanatorium on the Caucasian Black Sea coast.

Academic freedom

The academic rights and freedoms of students are guaranteed by the Statutes of the university which underlie the whole of university life. The Learned Council, according to the Statutes, directs all the scientific activities and studies at the university and decides all important questions pertaining to its work. Between sessions of the Council, the rector of the university is in charge of all current affairs.

The university course of studies is designed for five years. During this period each student specializes in one department. But to gain deeper knowledge a student may attend lectures and work in the laboratories of other departments as well. Each student may freely choose in the senior years the field of science in which he wants to specialize.

Students enjoy the same political rights as all citizens of our country: they have the right to elect and to be elected to organs of state power, the right to form their public organiza-

tions and to have their own press, and the right of assembly. It should be noted that the faculties and students of our universities take an active part in the public life of their country and their city. Among the students of Moscow University, for example, there are people's assessors who serve in courts, deputies of district, city and regional Soviets — self-government bodies.

Students also take an active part in the public life of their educational institution. Many students of our university are members of the scientific society, of various literary associations, amateur art circles and the sports society. The trade union is the most popular and largest mass organization in a higher educational institution, and it plays a large part in its life. The trade union organization cares for the interests of the students and their living conditions, it provides facilities for rest and recreation, and renders material help to students. Various problems of study, and shortcomings in the organization of tuition and scientific work are discussed at trade union meetings. Each student has the right to criticize and to submit any proposal.

Free exchange of views

I want to point out that in general a free exchange of views is characteristic of our studies and seminars. Seminars are always very lively in the philosophy department where I study. We acquaint ourselves in detail with the works of Russian and Western philosophers of the past — Plato, Descartes, Locke, Berkeley, Herzen, Chernyshevsky, and many others, and analyze thoroughly the views and theories of contemporary philosophers. Each student has full opportunity to express his views on the subject under discussion. The polemics at the seminar often turn into heated debates in which both instructors and students take part. The works of the personalists, the philosophers R. Fluelling, H. Hawking and F. Brightman, aroused many disputes and discussions at the seminars. There were interesting seminars on the theory of the pragmatists, and so on.

In general, education in our universities is aimed at developing in the students the ability to think independently. What is

characteristic of our university education is that it acquaints the student not only with the rules elaborated in the given field of science, but also scientifically substantiates them. The practical rules may swiftly grow obsolete or change with the present rate of development of science and engineering. The study of the scientific principles of a subject, however, develops the mind of the student, and teaches him to have an independent and creative approach to the problems in his sphere of science.

Scientific discussions

The student scientific society functioning in every Soviet institution of higher learning opens a wide field for scientific discussions, for creative work, to students in their respective fields. Any student may belong to this society. Working in circles of the society, students carry on independent research, take part in analyzing the work of their comrades, and prepare papers and communications on different scientific problems which then form the subject of discussions. A society publishes its own bulletins and reports, which carry interesting papers, essays, communications, descriptions of experiments and speeches made by students at meetings of circles and scientific conferences. Student scientific societies are very popular. In our university, for example, more than two thousand students work in scientific circles. Scientific societies of medical institutes have a membership of more than ninety thousand.

Student press

Freedom of the press in our university is ensured by the unlimited right of any student or instructor to make proposals and criticize shortcomings in education, not only at general meetings but also in the student press. The newspaper, *Moskovsky Universitet (Moscow University)*, has been appearing regularly for the past twenty-six years. Any undergraduate and postgraduate may contribute to it. The editorial board is elected. In their free time students help to put out their own paper. In addition, the students of each department and each year issue their own wall newspaper which discusses their

specific problems. Any student or instructor may contribute to these wall newspapers.

The university has a number of publications which print scientific studies of the students and the faculty — *Vestnik Moskovskovo Universiteta* (*Moscow University Herald*), *Uchenye Zapiski* (*Scientific Annals*) of the university, and *Uchenye Zapiski* (*Scientific Annals*) of the departments.

Work in one's line

The five years of studies pass swiftly. It seems as though the young man but yesterday came to his first lecture, and now he is already a graduate ready to work on his own. All graduates of a higher educational institution are provided work in their own field. Every one is assured work that suits his knowledge, wishes and calling. Several years later some of the young men and women who left the university for work in different parts of the country come back to their Alma Mater to continue their education as postgraduates, in order to get the Master's degree in their respective fields.

* * *

In conclusion, I would like to thank the editor for the opportunity to contribute to your magazine. I shall be happy if this article to some extent gives Christian students an idea of the life and conditions of study of Soviet youth, and in this way helps to strengthen friendly relations between students of different countries.

Academic Freedom and Religious Liberty in India

CHANDRAN DEVANESEN

It has now become quite a cliché to assert that India is a crucial testing ground for democracy in Asia. But it is nevertheless true that this absorbing experiment is turning every aspect of life into a battleground of rival forces. As in other countries, universities in India occupy a significant position in this struggle, because the problem of academic freedom is so vitally connected with the wider problems of religious, social and political liberty. Their significance is further enhanced by the fact that the students of Indian universities, who have always played an important role in national life, may suddenly return, with explosive violence, to the stage of politics which they seem to have quitted temporarily. Recent student disturbances in Lucknow, Allahabad and Trivandrum indicate what might happen on a country-wide scale, should elements outside the universities succeed in capturing their loyalty. It is still politics rather than religion which succeeds in capturing their loyalty. It is still politics rather than religion which excites the student mind, and it is doubtful whether many of them see any connection at all between academic freedom and religious liberty. This is partly due to an understandable impatience with whatever appears to be tainted with an outmoded liberalism at a time when extremism, whether of the right or the left, seems more relevant to the needs of a society in transition.

The role of university teachers

Outwardly there is nothing very much to suggest how deeply involved the universities are in this revolutionary situation. The swirls and eddies which occasionally ruffle the placid surface of university life are due to student discontent rather than to any activities of the teaching staff. Indian university teachers are not half as vocal as elementary school teachers.

There is no association of university teachers which carries any weight. The one subject which can arouse feelings at any time is the need for better scales of pay. The kind of thinking which the University Commission of the Federation has sponsored is practically non-existent in the wider university world. It is tragic that at such a time of significant conflict the average university teacher is a non-combatant, a spectator from the balcony of the changing Indian scene. And yet in a way it is a good thing too. This very inertia and lethargy acts as a kind of ballast, preventing the university from being completely submerged in political currents. But there can be no doubt that university teachers in India could play a very creative role in the present situation, if they could only acquire a heightened awareness of the tremendous relevance of academic freedom to the wider problem of freedom. In a recent order the government of Madras has threatened managements of educational institutions with the stoppage of grants-in-aid, should any member of their teaching staffs take part in politics. This has hardly called forth a protest from university teachers, though some newspapers have criticized the state government's attitude. While the action can be traced to fear of communist activities, it is distressing that the wider implications of the order have not aroused any noteworthy discussion in university circles.

But the picture is by no means entirely gloomy. The principle of university autonomy continues to be firmly established in India. An attempt by the central government to coordinate the activities of universities in India was resisted by the Vice-Chancellors and the Inter-University Board. The government of India wisely gave way and constituted a Central Advisory Board of Education and a University Grants Commission on the British model. This happy outcome revealed that the universities are determined to defend the principle of autonomy and prepared to safeguard academic freedom in their relationship as institutions to the state.

Universities and religious traditions

It was necessary to sketch the situation in the universities in India today in order that we may understand something of the background to the problem of academic freedom and reli-

gious liberty. The specific way in which the problem arises may be traced to the great part played by Christian missions in the development of higher education in India. Until the national awakening in this century, education was dominated by the British government and Christian agencies. Today, however, Christian institutions are in a minority. Since independence there has been a tremendous increase in the number of colleges through the efforts of the central and state governments and Hindu, Jain and Muslim philanthropists. There is a religious conflict implicit in this new situation. The protests against Christian institutions as agencies of proselytism only conceal the fact that other colleges have sprung up with a distinctively Hindu or Muslim atmosphere. Since the majority of Indian universities are based on the pattern of the University of London with its affiliated colleges, it is possible for all the religious communities to run their own institutions. In a liberal atmosphere this could be considered a fairly ideal system, with all the religious traditions represented within it. It has even been suggested that the universities themselves might create chairs for professors who would teach the philosophies of all the great religions. Apart from being complementary to a system of affiliated colleges run by the different religious communities, it would also be a recognition of the values of religion. It is pointed out that the liberal-rationalist nature of Indian universities inherited from the Western tradition (since all universities date from the second half of the nineteenth century) shuts out the real cultural genius of India which consists of its great religious traditions (Christianity being one of them), while every secular idea from scientific rationalism to materialistic atheism gains unimpeded entry. If the present system could make for religious harmony but fails to do so, we must seek the causes for this failure in the more general causes for religious conflict in India. From the wider historic point of view, Christianity came to be identified with Western culture and civilization. The introduction of Western education created a conflict of social and cultural values.

Educational policy

It is interesting to follow the trends in educational policy which were attempts to redefine these values. The truly great Indian personality in the nineteenth century was undoubtedly Raja Ram Mohan Roy, who was largely instrumental in overcoming the opposition to the introduction of Western education for Indians. The reform movements within Hinduism led to the second stage, which was the acceptance of Western technical education without the acceptance of Western cultural values. The strongest faculty in the Benares Hindu University, for example, was engineering! The third stage was the attempt to base education on a synthesis of Eastern and Western cultures illustrated by the Kalakshetra of the Theosophical Society in Madras, the University of Viswa Bharathi founded by Rabindranath Tagore, and the schools run by Sri Aurobindo's Ashram in Pondicherry. We have spoken of these aspects of educational policy as stages, but it must be remembered that exponents of all these attitudes are still present in India. The educational situation is still in a state of flux, and controversies about the medium of instruction and the Indianization of scientific terms only underline a deeper confusion as to aims and ideals. All these factors are reflected in the educational policies of the government and the universities. They can be seen in the following problems in the field of education:

(a) *The right of conversion.* To the Christian no freedom can be real unless it permits him to propagate his faith. A distinction must, of course, be made between proselytism using wrong means and the right of men to change their faith as a sincere recognition of a new truth to which they surrender themselves. In India there is widespread opposition to conversion, which is partly national and partly religious. Christian educational institutions are under attack, since they are suspected of using education as a means of conversion. Ironically enough they are criticized by Christians themselves as ineffective agencies of evangelism! But the policy of the government is more liberal than popular feeling, and the union constitution gives to every individual the right "to practise, preach and propagate his

religion". The application of this right to educational institutions has been carefully worked out. No religious education of any kind is to be given in state institutions. But state-aided institutions can give religious instruction to their students, provided no student is compelled to attend such classes without the written consent of his parent or guardian. Since extremely few conversions take place in Christian institutions, this provision applies mainly to the right to teach the Bible and to conduct Christian forms of worship. But in actual practice this depends largely on the degree of tolerance and sympathy of the students and the local community.

(b) *Syncretism*. On the religious and intellectual level, the most serious problem faced by Christians and Muslims alike is syncretism or the assumption that all religions are equally valid and true. It is a very ancient idea which is deeply rooted in Hindu philosophy. But it is also a feeling and a sentiment which springs readily to the lips of the simplest villager. There is only one ultimate Reality, one Godhead, of whom all the religions are only different manifestations. Therefore it is almost uncivilized in the eyes of a Hindu to assert that there is anything unique about any one revelation of God. This view is held sincerely and tenaciously by the vast majority of Hindus. It explains why India is the home of theosophy and the Ramakrishna Mission, whose founder taught equal respect for all religions. It is a point of view brilliantly expounded by able philosophers like Sri Aurobindo and Dr. S. Radhakrishnan.

From the theological point of view it is an idea which needs to be studied with respect. But it has become much more than a belief of the Hindus. There are strong elements of expediency about it. For one thing, it is a weighty argument against conversion, which is often blind to the rights of the members of other faiths who cannot agree with this doctrine. In its most aggressive form, it claims that conversion is unnecessary, as Hinduism is sufficiently catholic to accommodate all the other religious traditions. Another aspect of this idea is that Hinduism is the religion of the soil, while Islam and Christianity are foreign importations. In this way a religious attitude becomes overlaid with national sentiment. The liberal Hindus think of it as a means of inculcating harmony between religious

communities, while the more orthodox make it the basis of Hindu nationalism. There are Hindu parties like the Maha Sabha and the Rashtriya Sevak Sangh who make it an important plank in their political platforms.

When this syncretic view is advocated as an educational policy to be enforced by the state, it immediately becomes an issue affecting both academic freedom and the wider religious rights of the minorities. The Report of the University Education Commission (popularly known as the Radhakrishnan Report, after its distinguished chairman) strongly advocated it. The government, however, has not taken it up very seriously, and the effort to impose this dogma of syncretism is still a controversial matter rather than an official policy.

(c) *Dogmatic universities.* The claim that Hinduism is the religion of the majority leads to the assumption on the part of some of the more orthodox leaders that India should quite openly declare itself to be a Hindu state committed to the development of Hindu culture. It is a view which vitally affects the universities, for obviously they would be required to become the centres in which the Hindu way of life is inculcated. The claim is not always made in an illiberal or unattractive way. It is pointed out that this will not necessarily mean the suppression of other religions. India has always been a tolerant country, thinking of her unfolding history in terms of unity in diversity. But it immediately raises the whole problem of the nature and function of the university. There is a real need to make the thinking of the University Commission of the Federation widely known in India. The only way in which this understandable desire to make the universities serve Hindu culture can be countered, is by explaining why Christians themselves would not wish to have a university committed to the teaching of Christianity in a dogmatic way.

A secular, democratic state

If the government of India has not shown any keenness to implement hastily many of these suggested educational policies, it is mainly because it is committed to the concept of the secular state. Thanks to the leadership of Pandit Nehru, the constitu-

tion affirms that India is a secular, democratic state. The definition of academic freedom in India depends upon the definition of these two terms — secular and democratic — both concepts derived from the West. The fundamental problem of the Indian constitution is that it rests upon concepts which have no roots in the soil. Secularism in the West has a long history stretching from St. Thomas Aquinas to St. Harold Laski ! It has behind it a long struggle between Church and state. It has behind it the Renaissance and the Reformation. But the problem in India is how this secular concept can be reconciled with an ancient but newly-resurgent religion. When, for example, a Hindu author says, "Indian culture, civilization, life, thought and outlook in their essentials are quite favourable to the establishment of a tolerant, secular, democratic state", how far is he in danger of ignoring both historical and contemporary facts ? It is difficult to say to what extent the impact of the West has created conditions favourable to a secular society in India. In spite of growing industrialization and the spread of the rational and scientific outlook, the social and cultural milieu remains largely religious. Further, is it necessary that India should become secularized in the same way in which the countries of the West became secularized ? However, Christians in India are slowly coming to realize that the solution to the problem of religious conflict, particularly in the academic sphere, depends upon the adequate definition and popular acceptance of the ideal of a secular state for India. Recently a group of Christian leaders held a consultation in Nagpur under the Christian Council to discuss the meaning of the secular state in India. One of the statements of the consultation concluded with these words : "The will to be a secular, democratic state is present and was firmly expressed in the constitution. A process of growing together under a democratic constitution is inevitable. It is a period in which the various religious groups need to keep the common goal in view and go forward subjecting sectional interests to the national good, respecting one another's right to the liberty guaranteed to all under the constitution." Most of the universities of India represent the cooperative efforts of several religious communities. They are places where people of all faiths live, work and study together. The way in which they

tackle the problem of religious conflict and the pattern of freedom which they work out are of profound significance for the future of India.

We might conclude by saying that the problem of academic freedom in India is bound up with the desire to build a secular, democratic state. If the universities can solve the problem of religious conflict and establish democratic patterns of life, they will have a profound influence for good on the Indian state. If the universities can effectively demonstrate that religious liberty is the foundation of all other forms of freedom, we can confidently assert that India will have contributed effectively to the solution of many problems that confront the whole of Asia.

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

IN MEMORIAM

Sarah Chakko

In the sudden death of Miss Sarah Chakko, the student world has lost one of its foremost friends and leaders.

No doubt Miss Chakko was known throughout the world in the last few years primarily through her connection with the World Council of Churches. As first Secretary and then Chairman of its Commission on the Life and Work of Women in the Church, and later raised to an honoured position as one of its five Presidents, she was counted among the first rank ecumenical leaders of our time.

However, today as we look back on her life, we see that Sarah's first and most enduring love was for students. Soon after completing her studies, she chose teaching as her vocation, and whether in her pioneering efforts to start a school for girls in Travancore, or in her various positions in the Isabella Thoburn College in Lucknow, over which she presided with great distinction, she was true to that vocation. And it is perhaps symbolic that her last act was a game of basketball with her students — a sacramental act of fellowship with the student body she loved and served. If Isabella Thoburn has the reputation, not only for giving a Christian education to girls, but also for having knit together into a Christian fellowship a staff of Westerners and Indians, much of the credit should go to Sarah's leadership. Those who had the privilege of being at the college during the World Council Central Committee meetings last December, or have met the members of the Isabella Thoburn community elsewhere, know how much she has helped to build up the college as a Christian family, transcending national and cultural barriers, and how much her colleagues were bound to her by affection and reverence. During the December meetings I heard a foreign visitor ask an Indian friend, "How does Sarah go about so calm and unruffled? She has unhurried time for all of us"; and the Indian friend replied, "That dignified calm has become her nature. She has been able to develop it within this college community." Once in the course of her autobiographical reflections she said that it was within the trusting fellowship of colleagues that she learned Christian living. In the quietness and confidence of the Isabella

Thoburn community was the source of her strength. It was her base of operations.

Like many others, Sarah came to the ecumenical movement through the Student Christian Movement. She was connected with the S.C.M. of India, Burma and Ceylon throughout much of her life, for six years as its Chairman. That connection led to contacts with the World's Student Christian Federation. She was one of India's representatives at the Federation conferences in Java in 1933 and in San Francisco in 1936. On behalf of the Indian S.C.M. she visited China in 1947 on a mission of fellowship to the students there, and left a great impression. "She inspired us all," said an S.C.M. leader of Yenching University to me in 1948. She could inspire any audience anywhere by her lucid and profound speech. With students she was always at her best, because she had a vital message for them. I remember well her chairmanship of the General Committee of the Indian S.C.M. at Nasrapur, near Poona. I also saw her chair the international committee that met in Calcutta to plan the Travancore World Conference of Christian Youth. She could be strong, she could be gentle, she could untie knots. She was fair and she got things done. She was ever careful not to let the main purpose be forgotten. And if she made a mistake, there was always a woman's graciousness to cover it. This leads me to the one most lasting impression I had in her presence: that she represented what was best in India's tradition of aristocratic womanhood, redefined in the light of Christian and modern democratic values.

One could go on to talk about Sarah's contribution to the ecumenical movement at Amsterdam in 1948, and after. Certainly her crossing swords with Karl Barth at the Assembly received much publicity, but when I talked to her about it later, she was not happy about the impression the newspapers gave of her fighting for the "rights of women" in the Church. "What is important is the wholeness of the Church," she said. It was the basis on which she worked in the World Council's Commission on the Life and Work of Women in the Church. I still remember her speaking about the vocation of women in the Church and its relation to the Church's wholeness at the Federation Theological Students' Conference near Nuremberg, Germany, in 1950.

The vision of the wholeness of the Church was always before her. An Orthodox Syrian Christian by birth and upbringing, and actively in fellowship with the Methodist communion, she longed for the catholic unity of the Church. It was this concern that brought her to World Council leadership. She was also convinced that if the

World Council was to be truly of world character, it must transcend its dominant Western nature and develop an ecumenical imagination that can understand, feel with, and speak for, churches all over the world, whether in Eastern Europe or the lands of the younger churches. Those from Asia who are called to serve one or another of the world Christian organizations have a hard time persuading themselves that they serve world Christianity and not the West, and are able to justify themselves only by putting forward an earnest effort to make the organizations more world minded. That is what Sarah did with the World Council. This reminds me of the Chichester meeting of the World Council Central Committee, where the question of the possibility of its meeting in Asia before the second Assembly was discussed, and in spite of the resolution leaving it open, I was sure that the matter was shelved. The sense of the meeting was quite clear that for financial reasons it could not happen. And I believe it was the presence of Sarah Chakko at 17 route de Malagnou and her persuasion that brought a change in the atmosphere. No-one can convince me otherwise! The Central Committee did come to Isabella Thoburn, Sarah's own home. And no doubt it brought to the World Council as a whole a greater awareness, not only intellectual but also emotional, of the dimension of the concerns of Asian peoples and churches, and it brought a greater sense to at least some Eastern European and Asian churches that the World Council sincerely intends to be a *World Council*.

It may be national egoism for me to feel so proud of Sarah Chakko's contribution to the ecumenical movement. That pride remains, and it makes the sense of loss all the more acute. Nevertheless, it is as a world Christian leader that she lived, and it is in this light that her contribution is to be evaluated. The best memorial to her will be our renewed dedication to pray and labour for the ecumenical wholeness of the Church of Christ.

M. M. THOMAS.

KOREAN TRAVEL DIARY

FRANK ENGEL ¹

Arrival in Korea

At nine thousand feet we broke through the clouds that were keeping Tokyo grey, and soon saw the entrancingly beautiful snow-covered cone of Mt. Fuji rising another three thousand feet into the brilliant sunshine. A couple of hours later we were out over the straits and clear of all cloud. Something on the horizon began to take form. Yes, they were mountains — the mountains of South Kyung Sang in whose shadow I had been born. I found the sight intensely moving. I had not thought I would see them again and here I was flying "home". For the next forty-eight hours, I spent every spare moment just gazing and gazing at the mountains, the harbour, the people, the houses, the mission compound in which I had grown up — gazing in wonder that I was there, gazing with happy but turbulent feelings, a stranger and yet at home; the exile returned but only as a visitor.

The plane seemed determined to spin its wheels on this hilltop or the next. Then we were down, taxi-ing among the military aircraft of K9 airfield. The Korean customs officer held my declaration form and looked at me. Ominous? No, he was nudging his companion and pointing at the paper and glancing at me with curiosity. He had noticed my place of birth was Pusanjin — only a few miles away. The next minute I was through, and being welcomed by an Australian S.C.M.er turned missionary, Dick Kenyon, and the fraternal Student Secretary of the Y.M.C.A., Bill Costen of the United States.

I had expected to find Pusan still full of refugee universities from Seoul, as it had been for three years; but they had all returned to Seoul soon after the truce had been signed. In Pusan was the Pusan National University with 1,600 of its own students (and 750 others who were unable to go to Seoul for financial or family reasons), a branch of Chosen Christian University, and the Methodist Seminary. The first and possibly the second of these will remain in Pusan. A national university is a government one. There are five in Korea,

¹ The Rev. Frank Engel, General Secretary of the Australian S.C.M., paid an official visit to Korea on behalf of the World's Student Christian Federation in November and December, 1953.

Seoul, Pusan, Kyung-puk, Chun-nam, and Chun-puk. Seoul, with about 8,000 students, was originally the Japanese Imperial University and so has solid brick buildings, an air of permanence and a certain prestige. It escaped major war damage. The others were only founded after liberation in 1945. Pusan and Kyung-puk, for example, consist of bare wooden buildings, serviceable but inevitably temporary. The timber was provided by the United Nations Korean Relief Agency. It was in a small room of plain pine boards that I first met the Korean S.C.M. in Pusan University. This group was a newly-formed one and its membership doubled to forty in a week. We sat in the unheated room listening to an elderly but lively Korean pastor who had suffered much, as the fading light of a winter's afternoon wrapped us in the intimacy of twilight. A few days later, I spoke in the broad light of mid-day to a full assembly hall of 400 or so students — unlined walls and ceiling again, but this time a tape recorder also! Question: Is it polite to stop speaking when the recorder runs out of tape? Answer: I still don't know; but I didn't because the interpreter had used half the time. Incidentally, he was Min-ha Cho whom I had known as a student in Melbourne.)

Korea and Japan

In the grounds of the university, I saw a tall wooden post inscribed with characters. It had just been given to the history department by the Korean navy, who had removed it from a disputed island when the Japanese had erected it there after removing a stone which claimed the island for Korea! Later, I learned that as many as 600 Japanese fishermen were in Korean prisons for infringement of fishing grounds claimed by Korea. Negotiations over this and Japanese claims to their former property in Korea had been broken off. In this and other ways, Japanese tyranny has left its legacy of fear and suspicion which is not easily removed. "Other ways" include the disruption and recrimination within the church between those who stood firm against Japanese persecution and those who wavered or submitted. When I had passed through Tokyo, Kiyo Takeda had spoken of the legacy of hate left by thirty-five years' occupation, and asked me to say to Korean students, "Japanese Christian students are very sorry for the past bad relationships between our two countries and hope for a better one in the future. We should like to do something to help you at the present time. Would you please tell us in what ways we might help?" When I mentioned this message to a student leader, I received the

reply, "I don't know that Korean students are ready yet to receive help from Japan." I was not surprised — one could hardly expect anything else. I suddenly remembered what I had seen one morning as a small boy before I had been snatched back from the window — three pairs of police boots sinking into the prostrate form of a Korean, who had only gathered with other unarmed people to shout independence slogans. I had to agree that eight years of independence is not long in which to distil the hurts in the accumulated memories of thirty-five years of Japanese rule.

However, I had been given a message and it must be delivered, whatever the repercussions. Soon the opportunity came with a representative group of student Christian office-bearers. Without hesitation and without equivocation there came the reply, "If Japanese students feel sorry about the past, that is enough. We would like to correspond with them. Please ask them to pray for us in this great distress." The group then went on to give details of other help they would like to receive — Japanese text-books, periodicals and religious books. Later, I was given the names and addresses of twelve students in another group who desired to correspond with Japanese students. Later still, when back in Tokyo, I was able to give the reply, not only to Kiyo Takeda, but also to a group of thirty-six men and women student representatives of the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. in all the Tokyo universities. That also was a thrilling moment. As I handed over the twelve names and addresses, there was the sense that here, under God, was the beginning of a reconciliation.

Another message for abroad was from the Y.M.-Y.W. groups in Taegu whom I had been giving some news of various Movements in the Federation. When I finished, they said, "We are moved to hear news of students in East Germany and would send them our greetings and assurance of our prayers." This message I passed on to Kyaw Than, who delivered it personally. So the links of personal concern and Christian love are welded, and the fellowship which is the Federation takes on flesh for South Koreans and East Germans — and an Australian.

The state of the nation

Pusan and Taegu were both within the small area which was never overrun by the northern armies ; but both have been overrun with refugees. In Pusan, they have built their six by eight foot or six by twelve foot matchwood shacks on every spare spot — up the hillsides, over drains, even on top of one another. Roofs are of

light timber, cardboard, a discarded canvas camp-stretcher, or flattened-out army beer cans. I wandered over a hillside that was covered with these *hakabangs*, which are joined end to end almost endlessly. In between them are narrow, twisting footpaths. One of them seemed a dead-end. I turned back, but looked again. That woman had shut her door and I saw that the path ran on. Following it, I stumbled on a primary school, housed in wooden huts and tents. A teacher told me there were 2,000 children. Perhaps he meant 200 — numbers are tricky things to translate. And yet there must have been many more than 200. How industrious they appeared. How bleak and cold (or hot and wet) on this hilltop. Then there was a *hakabang* with a door open — a glimpse of a tiny, spotless room, the floor covered with a fresh-looking straw mat, the family's bedding stowed neatly away in the corner. Apart from this little room there was just enough space for the wife to squat and prepare the food which is cooked outside, on the edge of the path, on a brazier. Three weeks later, a brazier like that was kicked over accidentally on a very windy night. In a few hours, 25,000 people were homeless. A large part of the city, including the post office and railway station, was destroyed.

In spite of such war-time conditions and the general poverty, poverty is not the caste-ridden, deep-rooted, desperate, beggar-breeding thing it is in some of the cities of India. Surprising also is the fact that refugees from North Korea have built themselves refugee churches — some of them big, well-placed buildings. One of them still stands high above the centre of Pusan, although singed by the fire.

Seoul, on the other hand, is a war-smashed city. The train moved slowly across the long Han River bridge. We looked out in the early morning light at the shattered pylons of another bridge — one of them split to the bottom. We passed through damaged railway yards, past disabled locomotives, and drew into the battered remains of what was once a large, modern, concrete station. Great areas, especially of the southern and western sections of the city, are laid waste — about eighty-five per cent they say. Casualties include the Bible House (no sign of it), Y.M.C.A. (only walls), Severance Union Medical College and Hospital (eighty-five per cent destroyed), Chung Dong Methodist Church (where Syngman Rhee worships — only sixty per cent in use), Ewha Women's University minus a top storey, and Chosen Christian University minus several, while the Russian consulate lifts gaunt white walls from a shambles on a hilltop. Most of the damage occurred during the retaking of Seoul by United Nations forces and the communist retreat.

Taejon, where I spent a most interesting day at the triennial Y.M.C.A. conference, was almost totally destroyed except for a handful of buildings; but this is not at first obvious, because the area has been covered again with timber shacks and mud-walled houses. So also many other places; but these southern towns were damaged three years ago. My mind reeled at the effort of trying to picture Pyengyang, and other places I know in the north, after three years of almost continuous bombing. It reeled also at such figures about the south as — 125,000 orphans and unaccompanied children; 280 orphanages cannot cope with more than a quarter of the orphans; 50,000 school classrooms are required; one million of the three million children of elementary school age are not in school; 267 churches are completely destroyed, 706 "half-destroyed" but still used; "half a nation on relief, a whole nation in dire poverty". "If forty-five per cent of the population of the United States were on relief, we would still be better off, for the United States has vastly more in resources and services." Very true. Remember that forty-five per cent means over ten million people who are refugees, or have lost the breadwinner of the family, or their breadwinning hands or feet, as a result of the war, or are destitute. There are 294,000 widows with a total of 517,000 children.

And yet there is another side. There are the calm, dignified, serene faces of people who make no display of their poverty. There are large numbers of remarkably healthy-looking children. I am told that the amazing healthiness is probably due to the relief feeding which has come in from overseas — a statement borne out by the fact that children in country villages do not look as well as those in cities. The agencies that are making important contributions to immediate need are Korean Civil Assistance Command of the U.N., the Ministry of Social Welfare of the Republic of Korea, and the Christian missions. All the missions handle large quantities of clothing, food, medicines and money. The money alone amounted to about three-quarters of a million U.S. dollars in 1952. UNKRA is concerned with long-term reconstruction and is still largely involved in planning and negotiation, but its Educational Section, for example, has given 39,000 volumes to the libraries of nine universities and 2,000 tons of paper to the Ministry of Education for printing text-books. Then army units have given substantial help to orphanages and others — some remarkable generosity, but liable to disappear with the transfer of a unit. During the truce, the Eighth Army launched a big program of assistance of projects which Korean towns or institutions will be able to carry on themselves. World University Service is also making a contribution. I attended a

meeting of the Committee at the Y.W.C.A. called to consider the use of \$15,000 of an eventual \$100,000 promised by the American Committee of World University Service. The Committee is well set up with four representatives each from the Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., Korean Student Christian Federation, the Roman Catholic student organization, and one representative each from UNKRA, Church World Service, CARE and the Ministry of Education. It reaffirmed its earlier decision that the order of priority of student need is housing, health and scholarships, and decided on immediate steps towards establishing a hostel on the strength of encouraging news from Bill Kitchen, W.U.S. Secretary in the United States.

After speaking at Chung Ang University in Seoul, I had lunch with its remarkable owner and president, Miss Louise Im (or Yim), who is a member of the National Assembly. I asked, "What is the most urgent need in Korea?" Her one word reply was, "Employment." A sound economic structure is a desperate need. It is also extremely difficult to achieve, for Korea is an economic unit, and most of the mineral resources and electricity are in the north. It is said, however, that there are similar resources awaiting development in the south. On the other hand, the Korean economy needs a relationship to China or Japan, neither of which is desired politically at present. In the meantime, soldiers, railwaymen and other government employees are grossly underpaid. Hence, there is a lively black market in train tickets and a vast range of commodities. This economic chaos inevitably means that the political and administrative institutions are subject to great strains. When the over-riding necessities of war or the unifying political power of Syngman Rhee is no longer there, what will happen? Will Korea then become another Persia, trying desperately to cope with threats of anarchy, playing with democracy, because she lacks "a more or less honest, more or less reliable, and more or less capable administration"?¹

The university world

Statistics are not particularly easy things to collect in Korea, and they usually come in round numbers. I was given various figures for the total number of university and college students, ranging from 30,000 to 40,000, or 40,000 plus 7,000 who would be students if they were not in the army. As far as I could ascertain there are about 35,000. (In November, 1952, there were about 32,000.) These consist of about 20,000 university students and 15,000 college

¹ F. R. ALLEMANN, *Encounter*, January, 1954, p. 51.

students. In addition there are about 1,500 junior college students and several seminaries with about 750 students. There are eight major universities which are made up of five national (that is, state) and three private universities.

The private universities, all of which are in Seoul, consist of Chosen Christian University, Ewha Women's University and Korea University. The last of these is secular, while the first two were originally mission foundations which are now under self-governing boards but still closely related to missionary societies. C.C.U. has about 1,600 students, the great majority of which are men, but it has recently become co-educational. Ewha has over 2,000, 300 of them in residence, which means that it has more than half the total enrolment of women students in Korea. C.C.U. and Ewha are names to be conjured with in Korea. They have real standing and their graduates are making a considerable impression in national life. They both have good, modern, stone buildings and beautiful campuses. The buildings have been damaged by military action, but it has been possible to restore them. I was impressed by the contribution these two Christian institutions (along with the now non-existent Union Christian College in Pyengyang) have made through their graduates.

There are about twenty-four colleges of various kinds. These include some medical colleges not affiliated with a university, colleges with several faculties which are not yet fully recognized as universities, and some liberal arts colleges. Many of these are privately-owned institutions. They include the well-known Severance Union Medical College in Seoul — a leading missionary foundation — and Chung Ang, already mentioned, which has a Christian "bias", and real standing in the community.

In this field there are three Christian organizations at work — the Student Y.M.C.A., the Student Y.W.C.A., and the Korean Student Christian Federation. There is no radical or essential difference between them. The Federation came into existence in the period of rapid change and development from 1945-48, when the Y.M.C.A. had not yet been able to resume its full work in the student field. Now some universities have the K.S.C.F. and some the Y.M. or Y.W.C.A. There is a beginning towards greater cooperation and coordination between the three bodies to promote the maximum evangelistic effort. This is very important, because there is a very real religious opportunity among Korean students today.

India has to be secular because it has several lively religions. Korea is secular because it has little living religion. Buddhism has been the chief religion for many centuries, but is now very much

merely a part of the traditional background of life. Confucian teaching had a great influence once, but seems to have very little now. Ancestor worship, however, is still practised, especially in the country. There is, in other words, a considerable spiritual vacuum in Korea, as also in Japan. The aspirants for the job of filling the vacuum are Christianity, nationalism and communism. I put them in that order because communism is not an immediate live option in South Korea, except by military conquest. Nationalism has no religious form as it has in Japan in Shintoism, but it is a real force and a rather narrow and bitter one. Christianity is definitely a force in the life of Korea. Christian missions made remarkable progress there in the first fifty years of their work. There is a considerably higher percentage of the population which is Christian than is the case in Japan. Also a number of Christians are in positions of real leadership in public life. On the other hand, there are some definite weaknesses.

These weaknesses within Christianity consist partly of a too-ready identification of the Christian way and hope with the national way and hope. There is also some danger in the fact that Christianity has come to Korea largely from the United States. There have been small Canadian, Australian and English missions, but obviously the general pattern of church life, worship and institutions comes from the United States. In view of what has happened in China, and also in view of the growing anti-American feeling in Asia, this is unfortunate. Saying this does not, of course, reflect in any way adversely on the tremendous good which American missions and missionaries have done, but simply on the element of danger residing in the state of unbalance.

Sundry impressions and memories

Syngman Rhee, disliked and feared in Australia as a "dictator" or a firebrand who might ignite the third world war, has tremendous popular prestige and support in Korea. He is seen as the grand old man who devoted a lifetime to winning the thing dearest to a Korean heart — national independence — and united the majority in the south against the minority in the north, and fights for the rights of Korea against the foreign helpers when necessary. Albeit, ruthless at times. "We don't approve of all he does, but he's a good man," said several.

The R.O.K. armed forces are the only ones in Asia with a chaplaincy service — a strategic field for the church in which there is a considerable response.

Three thousand people worship in the great stone Yong Nak church in Seoul every Sunday morning. They do so in two shifts. This church survived an attempt to burn it down. It was here that I had the pleasure of being present at Hyun Ja Kim's marriage to Mr. Oh. Hyun Ja, the only Korean delegate at Nasrapur, is Student Secretary of the Y.W.C.A.

One Sunday morning I worshipped with a small (200) congregation which meets in a cold classroom that looks out over the ruins of part of Seoul. The windows had only recently been reglazed. It was announced that owing to the winter weather the early morning prayer meeting during the week would not be until 5.30 a.m.! However, the congregation was urged to come earlier for silent meditation beforehand. They take their religion seriously in Korea.

UNKRA is doing good work in face of great obstacles; but there is a need for its relationship to the Korean people to be rethought thoroughly. It tends to be an impersonal foreign agency doing good without any real interest in, or understanding of, the people concerned. Its staff lives on a scale that separates them even more than is necessary from the people. It seems high even by Western standards. Its programs need to be ones in which Koreans are participants at all levels, and not simply recipients.

I shall not soon forget the enthusiastic welcome I received from an audience of 500 organized by the K.S.C.F. at Seoul University; nor the few snow-flakes drifting across the open-air amphitheatre as I spoke at C.C.U., nor the girls there holding their cold noses in mittened hands. At Chung Ang, I was told the audience would be a general one, and therefore it would be well to speak on a subject of fairly general interest. So I tried not to be "too Christian"! Then, to my complete surprise, I was asked to give the benediction before I left. It has rarely had more meaning for me.

Nor shall I soon forget the journey to C.C.U., which is on the other side of a hill from the city. An Englishman told the Korean taxi driver where to take me. It soon became clear that the driver had not listened or the Englishman's Korean could have been better. It also rapidly became clear that neither the Korean civil nor military police in the area could help us — nor the bookshops. I struggled to remember the Korean name of C.C.U., but none of my guesses hit the mark. Then we cruised aimlessly past the Russian Orthodox Church. I dashed in desperately and found a Greek army chaplain who spoke little English but seemed to know where C.C.U. was. We bundled into the taxi, but he directed it to the headquarters of an American military unit. It soon transpired that we were looking for an American-Greek who could act as interpreter! Event-

ually, we found him sick in bed. He hadn't heard of C.C.U. Frantic inquiries of other Americans and Koreans in the building yielded nothing. By this time, it was very late. At last, a Korean sergeant was found who spoke English and knew the answer. After all these international involvements, I arrived late to speak on forgiveness!

Reconciliation is one of the major tasks that confronts Christians in Korea — as in Australia. Reconciliation with Japan, with the north, with those who collaborated with the Japanese and those who collaborated with the Chinese communists. Reconciliation between "fundamentalist" and "modernist", between this political or religious group and that. And the key to all this is forgiveness. There is no hope without it — acceptance of God's forgiveness of us and the forgiving of one another. Christianity is terribly and uncomfortably relevant in Korea — and wherever we allow ourselves to see ourselves and our situation as it actually is.

In Pusan, I used a map one night when telling students of the Federation. Afterwards one who had to struggle with his English said, "You made a gracious meeting at the map, but now we must go to our own living ground, and there is disappointment." There's the rub. And there's the glory — to be a part of the forgiven and forgiving community, the beloved community, in a world of faction, tension and violence. "Let your light so shine..." sounds nice when read in a comfortable and well-lit church; but it hurts to shine in darkness, trying to push back the great blackness. Yet that is the only place light is of use. Nor is it a vain struggle, if our flickering light is in fact a reflection of that life which is the light of men, which shines in darkness and which the darkness has not extinguished.

Departure

All too quickly there came the day of farewell. Dick Kenyon drove me out to K9, or as far as the jeep deigned to go. An American air force jeep then kindly obliged, leaving Dick to await help by the roadside. I had been welcomed at this airport by foreigners. Now I was farewelled by Koreans. President Yun of Pusan University, a fine Christian and notable resister of Japanese oppression, had graciously come out all that distance. Min-ha Cho and "John" Yang, student president of K.S.C.F., were among those there. It was good to have them all there as my final minutes in the land of mountains and rivers and among a great and lovable people ticked away. It was good to take with me the photos they had so hurriedly developed of yesterday's meeting at the university, and *Pictorial Korea* with their best wishes.

And then, so suddenly, it was all over. The plane headed east over the water. The mountains, which I had found so intensely moving a month before, grew dim. I strained to see the last ridge and peak, and then sat back in my seat overwhelmed with sadness. But with it was profound thankfulness that I had been privileged to be with a people who have in such a remarkable way accepted the incredible sufferings of the last three years and remained uncrushed, who go calmly ahead as if life were normal, who hold high a proud head with a twinkling eye, who laugh and are resolute. I thought of their past and their destiny. Beneath me, the ships of Hideyoshi had sailed in 1592 to ravage Korea. And in their wake, 300 years later, had sailed other ships of war from Japan to drive first the Chinese and then the Russians out of Korea. And now there had come from afar, ships of the sea and the air to do the same thing again but in the name of many nations. Korea — bridge, crossroads, cockpit. Fought over, but never subdued. Strategically significant to others yet always herself. A geographical position akin to ancient Israel's. And the same destiny? A suffering servant till the knowledge of God covers the earth as the waters the sea? A bridge for the Church as for the nations? What is the meaning of such great suffering, in the providence of God? Is there a light to illumine it other than the radiance from a tomb?

The answers can only be given in Korean; but the faithful prayers, consecrated insights, sacrificial gifts, and humble student volunteers of that sustaining and sharing fellowship which is the W.S.C.F. can help in the formulation of answers that are lively and true, and which declare and set forward God's holy and loving purpose.

LATIN AMERICAN TRAVEL DIARY

VALDO GALLAND

On the first part of the flight from Montevideo to Asunción our plane flies over the whole of Uruguay and a small corner of Brazil. The frontier passes unnoticed; the view is always the same — immense green fields with their grazing herds of cows and sheep, here and there a dirt road, a small river bordered by trees, a town. I am reminded of what my wife sometimes says to tease me: "Your country is really nothing but a big farm!" The landscape of Argentina and Paraguay is at first much the same, but is arid in patches as we approach the subtropical area; then some marshy regions, and forests of exotic trees, as we near Asunción. For some time before landing the pilot circles the city, with its splendid harbor on the Paraguay river, which forms practically the only entrance into this country, hemmed in between Brazil, Argentina and Bolivia.

I took advantage of my two and a half day stopover between planes in Asunción to see my missionary friends of the Disciples of Christ Church. Each time I pass through the Paraguayan capital I am a guest at their *Colegio Internacional*. Had it not been during the final examination period, I could have met with a group of students, but in any case I did attend a faculty dinner. Always when I leave Asunción I dream of the day when there will be a group of Christian students within the college, who would form the nucleus of an S.C.M. on the university level — an S.C.M. which could do great and wonderful things for the Church and for the country, economically poor but immensely rich in possibilities.

La Paz

Roberto Rios, who was a delegate to the General Committee at Nasrapur, and three students and a minister from the Canadian Baptist mission had come to the airport at La Paz to welcome me. After the usual immigration and customs inspections, we headed for the city in the Baptist jeep. Arriving at the edge of the plateau on which the airport is located, you see the city of La Paz — with its centre of modern apartment buildings and its outlying districts of old houses, many of them in wretched condition — hugging closely the contours of the earth in the valley twelve hundred feet below, and surrounded by imposing mountains, several of them snow-

covered. After a moment's contemplation of the scene, we began the descent of the winding road which leads to the heart of the city.

It is not uncommon to meet in the streets of La Paz Indians in their traditional garb and half-breeds carrying rifles. The government has armed them so that it can put down at any moment a possible revolt aimed at changing the course of the social revolution imposed by the present authorities. President Paz Estensoro, elected by the people at the last elections, was only able to take over his office through a revolution to overthrow the former government, which was unwilling to recognize the results of the elections. Under his presidency, the country is undergoing a profound social transformation, aimed at bettering the condition of the lower classes, especially the masses of Indians. This kind of change can never be accomplished except at the expense of the large capitalists, and it is to be expected that these powers will complain. Moreover, there are always others of the same class who are ready to listen only to their version and to magnify it if necessary. Thus has grown up the stupid accusation: "It is communist." The misfortune of countries which — like Guatemala — embark upon a necessary social revolution, is that the very accusation of communism really pushes them to the communist side. Let us hope that this will not happen in Bolivia, which is in the very throes of an experience from which she has much to gain.

The Church in Bolivia

I had a most interesting conversation on the church situation in Bolivia with a missionary, the Rev. Le Grand B. Smith, whom I had met two years previously in Barcelona when I was making my first trip as a Federation Secretary. The Methodists in this country, like the Disciples in Paraguay, regret the decision taken at the Congress in Panama in 1916, which fixed the boundaries of the fields of work of those denominations which did not wish to compete with one another. Those who made the decision could not foresee what is happening today. These denominations, which have a sense of the historic continuity of the Church, find themselves surrounded by numerous sects, where individualism reigns, which sow division, and where the important thing is personal, to the exclusion of corporate, experience. In this environment it would doubtless be helpful for the ecumenical denominations to have sister churches for their mutual encouragement through common efforts. In this connection it is clear that a decision which is right in theory is not always the best in practice.

During my conversation with Mr. Smith I learned one piece of excellent news concerning the decision of the last Methodist Conference of Bolivia with regard to missionary colleges, of which there is one in La Paz and another in Cochabamba. Both have splendid reputations, and their great problem is that they are unable to accept all the students who apply for admission. The conference decided that henceforth the colleges will openly proclaim their Protestant character and will not abstain from doing evangelistic work among their students. This decision was made in view of the fact that at the present time there is nothing typically evangelical about merely instructing, spreading culture, and teaching English. A large number of national, international or North American organizations are doing just this. If missionary colleges can do no more, it would be better to close them. But they can do a great deal more, and it is cause for rejoicing that the Methodist Church is ready to face up to this responsibility. It will doubtless contribute greatly to the strengthening of the newly-created S.C.M.

A live S.C.M.

At the time of my first visit to La Paz there was no trace of an S.C.M. This time I found a live group of about twenty students. It was organized partly as a result of the participation of a student, Berta Barriga, in the São Paulo conference, and partly thanks to the leadership of two young Methodist missionaries, who were later joined by Roberto Rios on his return from Nasrapur. During my short stay in La Paz I had two meetings with this S.C.M., and they were surely among the most interesting in which I have been privileged to participate in Latin America. What distinguishes this group is doubtless the fact that the majority of the members are Catholics, nominal of course. Some are former students of the Methodist school; others have been won by the original group. The evangelical students who form the core of the group are not animated by any spirit of proselytism; they simply wish to live — as students and with their fellows — their Christian faith. All meetings begin with a period of meditation, led by a student, Catholic or Protestant.

Peru

I was ridiculously happy at the thought of flying from La Paz to Lima. I treasured a dazzling memory of the trip in the opposite direction two years previously, with the crossing of the Andes and the flight over Lake Titicaca. I was not too disappointed. I saw

Titicaca again, or at least another part of it, full of islands and peninsulas; I could not but think of the Greek peninsula, with which I had not been acquainted when I flew over this lake the last time. We crossed the Andes amid many clouds, the sky clearing for the remainder of the trip. Once more I was struck by the insignificant size of the inhabited areas which seem lost in the vast, deserted tracts. But I am told this is characteristic only of the coastal area; more towards the interior of the country green prairies predominate.

Arriving in Lima, I found my way after some difficulty to the Wolfe Memorial, which serves as headquarters of the Methodist mission, where I was to stay. Although there had been two evangelical student organizations in Lima at the time of my first visit, this time there were none. By contrast, I found four efforts to organize one: the first by the Methodists, a second by a student of the Evangelical Church of Peru, a third by evangelical elements of Pentecostal or non-denominational leanings, and the fourth by an English girl, a missionary among the Jews, who was formerly a member of the British I.V.F. It seems that a union of the first two initiatives would present no difficulties, with perhaps the inclusion of some elements of the third. In any case, the possibilities of work are enormous, for the Evangelical student group in the Peruvian capital is constantly growing. This was obvious at a meeting which I had with a group of students who came in spite of it being the period of preparation for examinations.

Trujillo

During this my second visit to Peru I was not satisfied to visit only Lima. After two days I took a plane for Trujillo, the third largest city of the country, in the northern coastal area. Several months before young pastor Eduardo Aguilar, his wife Irene and their two children had established themselves there. He had previously organized a group of Methodist students in Lima, and I had made his acquaintance there in 1952.

He was waiting for me at the airport, and we went by car to his home. I knew that they had chosen the poorest quarter of the city in which to preach the Gospel and to build a Christian community; the Methodist Church had not previously had work in Trujillo. I also knew that the Aguilars were living in a humble home, and soon I saw it for myself. The streets of the district are of dirt, or rather dust; the bands of children who pour from every doorway play in them all day long, and get filthy from head to foot.

Gutters, where dirty water and all sorts of garbage are thrown, run through several streets. The Aguilar's house, like all the others in the neighbourhood, is made of adobe (unbaked brick); the floor is of hard-packed earth; the only window is the square cut in the flat roof, which is woven of bamboo and rushes. There is no glass in these windows — only some lattice to keep out the leaves and birds, for in this country it is never very cold and it never rains. There is no electricity or running water; water is drawn up with a bucket and rope from a well dug beside the kitchen. At the far end of a piece of ground, behind a screen of rushes, are sanitary facilities of the most primitive kind.

The first and finest room of the house is reserved for meetings and services; it is furnished with a communion table, which serves also as a pulpit, some benches and chairs. During his several months of work Aguilar has gathered together a hundred children who attend Sunday School regularly. At the other meetings there are perhaps not many in the room; but more are outside, close to the door, especially those who dare not enter but who want to listen to the preaching of the Gospel. I spoke at one such meeting and also had an opportunity to preach to a congregation of the Evangelical Church of Peru (formed by the union of several missionary enterprises). There is an interesting story behind the origin of the Trujillo Christian community. It was born as a result of Bible colportage. A man of the city, whom everyone calls Don Pablito and who is known to all because he uses his gifts of healing for the benefit of the people, one day had a dream in which he was told that he must read a book which would soon be offered to him. Soon after a colporter came to see him. Remembering his dream, he bought a copy of the Bible, and it was through reading it that he became a believer and began to tell of his faith in Jesus Christ. Thus was born a Christian community which has finally joined the Evangelical Church. Don Pablito continues to exercise his gifts as a healer, and from the voluntary offerings which he receives, he contributes generously to the support of the church and the upkeep of the chapel which he has had built.

The second room of the Aguilar house is divided into two parts by a wall halfway to the ceiling. The smaller half serves as a guest room, and here the Aguilar's often shelter those who are in need. The other half is the pastor's study, furnished with a library of excellent theological books. Here I had three meetings with the group of students who make up the S.C.M. of Trujillo. It is composed of representatives of three or four Evangelical denominations and several Catholics. Aguilar, who is himself enrolled at the Univers-

ity of Trujillo, has organized this group, with which I was able at various times during three consecutive days to exchange views on all the subjects which interest a Latin American S.C.M.

A consecrated life

The several days spent in Trujillo were one of my finest experiences as a Federation Secretary. This was largely due to the fact that I shared the consecrated life of the Aguilars. I know that they do not think they are doing anything extraordinary, and from the point of view of the Gospel, this is true: we are all unprofitable servants. Nevertheless, they are doing everything which they feel it is their duty to do in conditions which one does not see every day, at least in the milieu of student work. It was a splendid experience for me also because I was able to share fully in their life, since their dedication is not in the name of some kind of asceticism, or of some moral principle, or to satisfy some social concern; it is to Jesus Christ, the living Lord, whom one feels is fully present in their home. That is why I left Trujillo and these friends, full of hope for their missionary efforts and their work among students, and all the more so because the Methodist mission has just bought a rather large house, where the Aguilars must now be living, and where not only will they have better material conditions, but where they will also organize a student centre. This promises well for the S.C.M. which, thanks to the leadership of Aguilar, is already imbued with the Federation spirit.

I returned to Lima to board the plane for Cuba and the Federation Leadership Training Conference for the Caribbean area at Matanzas. (For a description of this important meeting see the *Federation News Sheet*, March-April, 1954.)

BOOK REVIEWS

PETRUS, JÜNGER, APOSTEL, MÄRTYRER, by Oscar Cullmann. Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich, 1952. 282 pp. 17.70 Sw. Fr.

French edition: SAINT PIERRE, DISCIPLE, APOTRE, MARTYR, by Oscar Cullmann. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel et Paris, 1952. 232 pp. 12 Sw. Fr.

English edition: PETER, DISCIPLE, APOSTLE, MARTYR, by Oscar Cullmann. S.C.M. Press, London, 1953. 252 pp. 18s. Also Westminster Press, Philadelphia.

SCHISM IN THE EARLY CHURCH, by S. L. Greenslade, S.C.M. Press, London. 247 pp. Harpers, New York, 1953. 243 pp.

It is a fair guess that among the readers of this quarterly who are still in universities and theological colleges are the persons who will bear major responsibility for the ecumenical movement in years ahead. Those who anticipate a growing occupation with questions of Christian unity, either as laymen or clergy, will have missed an important opportunity for enlightenment on the subject if they fail to read these two books. Cullmann's remarkable book on Peter is critically important for Christian unity because of the centrality of this apostle in the Roman Catholic claim to authority. Unless the Church of Rome be entirely ignored in discussions of unity, it is of primary importance for us to know who Peter really was and what his significance in the Church is.

Do not expect from Cullmann a romanticized biography of St. Peter, such as the late Lloyd C. Douglass' *The Big Fisherman*. Expect instead as lucid and objective a reconstruction of the life and influence of the "Rock-man" as can be made with the dependable data about him still available today.

The makers of jokes know St. Peter only as the porter at the pearly gates. The Roman Catholics revere him passionately as the prince of apostles and the first pope. Are Protestants content to depict him (as a counter to Rome's claims) only as the disciple who three times betrayed his Lord?

Conscientious Bible readers will be delighted to see how Cullmann has dealt honestly and shrewdly with the inadequate New Testament references to Peter. His exegesis is so irrefragable that we can

believe his portrait to be accurate, just as we believe the drawings of a skilled palaeontologist who describes a pre-historic man on the basis of a jaw-bone and a femur.

In the Gospel narratives Peter represents the disciples as their spokesman in dialogue with Jesus, but he is not their leader. The various incidents involving Peter plainly reveal his impetuosity and instability. But the record is equally plain that he spoke for the Twelve, was the confessor of Jesus' Messiahship, the first witness to the Resurrection, and (concludes Cullmann) received his unique apostolic commission from the Risen Lord.

As an apostle of the early Church, Peter's prominence is attested in Acts and the Epistles. But information about his ministry is strangely fragmentary. After playing the leading role in the early chapters of Acts, he is utterly ignored in the later ones. Cullmann can discern and demonstrate two things, however: (1) Peter's position as the head of the Jerusalem church lasted a very short time before it was taken over by James, the Lord's brother. Then he devoted himself to extending the Gospel by preaching. "Peter is not the archetype of the church official, but of the missionary." (2) Although Peter is usually blamed for being a member of the "Jewish party" of the early Church, in contrast to St. Paul's universalism, Cullmann shows that, in fact, Peter was much closer to Paul in theology and missionary outlook than were any other apostles.

The main task of this book is not to paint a portrait of Peter, but to enquire into reasons for his perennial importance in the Church. What is the significance of the words in Matthew 16: 17-19: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church"? Was Peter ever in Rome? How do these questions relate to the claims of the papacy?

Under the dome of St. Peter's basilica in the Vatican are emblazoned with great letters the words, *Tu es Petrus*. Cullmann as a biblical scholar is persuaded that these words of the Gospel were really spoken by Jesus, although probably in the setting of the passion story rather than at Caesarea Philippi. He believes that Jesus did commission Peter as the apostle who, through his personal knowledge of the Messiah and witness to His person and work, would be the foundation upon which *Christ* Himself would build the Church. But with every possible form of expression the author declares that the commission given to Peter was not transferable to any successors. There is thus no closer connection between Peter and the present pope than between him and any other faithful member of the Church. Cullmann asserts that the Roman claim to authority has never been

theologically or historically substantiated : the whole dogma of papal infallibility is constructed upon a begged question !

Then what of the evidences that Peter came to Rome ? Cullmann examines meticulously the earliest documents referring to Peter's visit, and studies also the liturgical and archaeological evidence, especially the recent, widely-published excavations of Peter's "tomb". His conclusion : in all likelihood, Peter came to Rome as a missionary, worked a very short time, was executed during the Neronian persecution, and buried in a place which still cannot be determined.

Granting this, Cullmann demands to know how the fact of Peter's presence in Rome can possibly yield evidence that he was *bishop* of Rome, or that he transmitted the absolute apostolic authority of the Lord to the succession of bishops in that city.

This book is not a kind of defiant polemic against Rome. It is a carefully-documented, sincere and charitable enquiry, by a man who wants to know the truth of Christ's intention for the Church. As such it is a significant contribution not only to church history but to the contemporary conversations on Christian unity.

Friendly critics, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, have already contested Cullmann's concept of the Church's continuity with Jesus Christ, saying that he leaves an "unbridgeable hiatus" between the Lord's apostle and the on-going Church. This criticism does not seem wholly justified, since the author does write, in respect to Protestants, Orthodox and Roman Catholics : "In reality, every Church needs also the apostle Peter, because he as 'first' among the twelve apostles has to guarantee the continuity with the incarnate Jesus" (p. 222). But we may hope that this eminent scholar will develop the implications of that statement more clearly.

*

Schism in the Early Church is a study which can be ranked with *Peter* because of general excellence and importance for the ecumenical movement. Much has been said recently about "the social and cultural factors" affecting Christian unity : politics, nationalism, etc. Theologians have tended to see church divisions only as the result of doctrinal disagreements. Historians and sociologists generally seek strictly secular causes for the multiplicity of denominations. But Luther, for example, cannot be judged fairly if only his German nationalism or only his passion for the doctrine of salvation by faith is considered.

Greenslade makes a rare contribution to our understanding of why the visible unity of the Church has not been maintained. In a most enlightening and factually dependable study of the schisms of the early centuries, he illustrates the effects of the following factors : personal love of power ; nationalism and social and economic interests ; rivalry in ecclesiastical politics ; disputes over liturgical practice, and problems arising from disciplinary action in the Church. In respect to each of these, history has shown its capacity to repeat itself.

It is easy for us to ridicule or castigate the leaders of the ancient Church on account of their divisive contentiousness, while we look upon our present divisions with patience and respect for the numerous issues involved in them. As a Christian historian, however, Greenslade shows sincere sympathy for our Christian ancestors, who acted for the most part on the promptings of faith and conscience. The sins of these fathers have not only been visited upon, but perpetuated by, the numerous generations of their children.

Being fully perceptive of the theological dimension of disunity, Greenslade examines the questions which were then, and are now, of radical importance : Is there one undivided Church, visibly continuous in its unity, outside of which are all schismatic groups ? Or is the one Church inwardly divided by schisms ? His own answers are clearly No to the former and Yes to the latter.

His demonstration of the fallacy in speaking of the "undivided Church" of the early centuries cannot be easily refuted. He therefore challenges (and, many will say, overthrows) the teaching enunciated by Cyprian, that all schismatics leave the true Church, and the sacraments performed by their clergy have no validity. Augustine dealt more charitably with the dissidents, but reached the awkward conclusion that their orders and sacraments are valid but not efficacious. Greenslade regards Augustine's view as being grotesque. The only alternative to these teachings is to recognize that the one Church is indeed in a divided state within itself — contrary as this may be to the inherent purpose of the Church.

The writer is an Anglican priest, but not one who shares the distinctive views of Anglo-Catholics. It is of special importance for non-Anglicans to read his concluding chapters on the meaning of schism in relation to Christian unity. Here he enters the central area of controversy in contemporary Faith and Order discussions, and asserts his convictions with force and precision. He is persuaded that recognition should be granted to certain non-episcopal ministries and the sacraments performed through them. Hence, to avoid Augustine's fallacy, it should be admitted that certain non-episcopal

denominations are truly within the *Una Sancta*. The practical consequence of such recognition is intercommunion, for "there is enough unity of spirit to demand it, and to be injured if it is refused".



Both of these books, therefore, consist of competently ordered historical materials which support the authors' firm convictions on basic controversial issues affecting Christian unity. The following passage by Greenslade expresses the earnest belief of them both:

"We all know that the ending of schism, if that is to be vouchsafed to sinful man on earth, will be the act of God; but it will be God's act through us, calling out all our spiritual resources. Should we not both examine our own forms of Christianity to see if anywhere they are weakened or distorted . . . and also open our minds to the distinctive insights of our fellow Christians of other nations" (page 73).

J. ROBERT NELSON.

THE CHRISTIAN SCHOLAR. 257 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y.
\$3.00 per year.

A new journal has appeared on the scene that will be of vital interest to readers in America and abroad. Published by the Commission on Christian Higher Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, *The Christian Scholar* occupies a unique position. It has a breadth, depth and pointedness of coverage unknown to secular education journals on the one hand, and to the usual denominational efforts on the other. A reading of the first four issues of *The Christian Scholar* conveys to one the sense of excitement and personal engagement which motivates the editor and the contributors.

Editor J. Edward Dirks describes admirably the purpose and role of the journal in his preface to the first issue. The premise of this quarterly is that we are witnessing in our time a "theological renaissance". This phenomenon is not limited to academic theology. It has permeated and been stimulated by the finest minds in every area of human thought. A substantial number of concerned people within and without the ecumenical church have come to the conclusion "that Christian thought must advance to live, that its horizons must be broad at the same time that its analyses are profound, and that it may serve as the intellectual foundation for all

areas of scholarly inquiry as well as for Christian, and ultimately human, reunion in our century". *The Christian Scholar* is a publication devoted to an exploration of higher education from the perspective of the Christian faith and heritage, as it is being rediscovered in both the current theological renaissance and the revolution of our time. It has a two-fold commitment. It seeks not only to uncover the implications of the Christian faith for contemporary higher education, but it seeks new and deeper meanings in the Gospel itself. In short, it attempts to relate the Faith to the world as well as to itself.

While its primary point of focus is the "Christian scholar" and the "Christian community on the campus", including students, teachers, administrators, and college pastors, it also hopes to speak to and for all who are unhappy with the current dead-end streets in education and religion. It is committed to the task of integrating faith and scholarship.

With such a view of its premise, task and audience, this journal takes an honoured place as another significant voice in the continuing theological conversation, demanded by the vitality of the Christian tradition and the unabated difficulty and importance of republishing Christianity in a context which is growing increasingly secular.

An editor's preface introduces each issue. This preface either pursues consideration of the purpose and role of the journal or inaugurates discussion of issues on which study and judgment are invited. The major articles present a balanced discussion of the Christian responsibilities and opportunities of all the members of the campus Christian community as they work in relation to the total academic community, the Christian Church, and the world. The first issue deals broadly with the whole range of interests outlined above. The second issue explores the role of Christian faith in relation to the curricular disciplines and to developments in general education. The contrast between modern positivistic views of truth and the Christian understanding of truth provides the context for the primary materials of the third issue. Much of the material in the fourth issue is devoted to poetry and modern thought, on the assumption that the arts are again being recognized today not only as the creative, imaginative expressions of culture, but as being among our best clues for an understanding of the deeper movements of our age.

A portion of each issue is devoted to reports and announcements of major developments, conferences and proposals in all areas of Christianity and higher education in both the United States and

abroad. Reviews and announcements of the more significant publications in the same field are included in each issue.

This journal should be of great interest to many types of readers. One will find here religious thought which is thoroughly competent, loyal to the historic Christian tradition, and open to the best values afforded by the intellectual efforts of our day. Those who are complacently indifferent to both "professional" and "lay" theology ought to find themselves shamed and stimulated by the concern and insight manifested in these pages. For all of us, this new journal can be an exciting agency of genuine illumination and encouragement.

HAROLD H. DITMANSON.

CONCISE BIBLE COMMENTARY, by the Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke.
S.P.C.K., London, 1952. 30 s.

It is difficult indeed to pass judgment on a book of this kind. It shows such an amount of reading and study that our first reaction must be one of respect for the author. He says himself in his preface that he has worked on the Bible, making notes, for more than forty years. He has followed closely the evolution of historical criticism and acknowledges both its value and its limitations. He is anxious to remain "objective" in his statements, and therefore often quotes a number of authors on controversial subjects, but lack of space forbids a real discussion of the issues, and the conclusion reached by the author inevitably appears somewhat arbitrary. The real problem is whether he has not attempted too much in including in one volume about thirty articles dealing with all the archeological, historical, exegetical and doctrinal problems that a student of the Bible has to face, plus a commentary on all the books of the Old and New Testaments. The first question which arises in one's mind is: for whom is such a commentary intended? If it is meant for laymen, many technical details, which make the reading of the introductory articles rather dry, might have been omitted. The commentary proper is conceived in the form of what we might call "marginal notes"; it does not really give the substance of a given book or passage — what the Germans would call its *Sitz im Leben*, the message it was meant to convey to the people for whom it was written. If, on the other hand, the book is intended for students of theology, it may be useful as a kind of *vade-mecum* for beginners, but it does not avoid the danger of over-simplification of the problems.

We must confess that if we wanted to introduce a student to the world of the Bible, we would still give our preference to a book such as *A Companion to the Bible* edited by T. W. Manson (1945) or to a commentary like the Abingdon Bible Commentary. The aim of the present writer has evidently been to condense in one volume the main results of modern scholarship, and to make them accessible to those who cannot afford larger works.

SUZANNE DE DIÉTRICH.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Under Three Flags, by Stephen Neill. Friendship Press, New York. Cloth, \$2.00, paper \$1.25. 185 pp. The author, who was for twenty years a missionary in South India, and has been Bishop of Tinnevely, describes the political and social problems and the outstanding progress made in these fields in recent years in India, Pakistan and Ceylon, where, he says, "decisions taken in the next few years... will have the gravest significance for North America and the whole of the West." He tells of the influence of the 11,000,000 Christians in a population of over 445,000,000, and of the remarkable range and variety of Christian medical, educational and social services, and points out how much the economic and educational progress now sponsored by the governments owes to the pioneering and continuing work of Christian missions. The chapter on "Why Missionaries?" raises such provocative questions as: Could the Indian churches survive if all foreign personnel were withdrawn? Are missionaries still needed?, and in answering them the author concludes that West and East must work together: "The command of Christ stands unchanged; his gospel must be preached to the ends of the earth and to every creature."

Christian Teaching in the Churches, by John Q. Schisler. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, New York. \$2.50. 173 pp. This study examines the "what and why" of Christian education and the challenges it faces today, its objectives and responsibilities to children, youth and adults, and its relation to the entire work of the church and to worship and evangelism. One chapter deals with religion and the public schools and makes suggestions for cooperation between the church and public schools.

Guide Lines for Group Leaders. The Why and How of Group Work, by Janet P. and Clyde E. Murray. William Morrow and Co., New York. \$3.95. 224 pp. This book tries to answer the many problems facing men and women in positions of group responsibility who have not had special training in social work. It gives practical suggestions for dealing with a great variety of situations, with case work illustrations, deals with different kinds of groups, ranging from children to adult and community work, and describes types of programs and methods for building them. Mrs. Murray has had wide experience in group work in the Y.W.C.A., and together the authors worked for many years in the Manhattanville Neighborhood Centre in cooperation with Union Theological Seminary.

A Doctor's Casebook in the Light of the Bible, by Paul Tournier. S.C.M. Press, London. 16 s. 256 pp. Translated from the French edition published under the title *Bible et Médecine* by Delachaux et Niestlé Neuchâtel and Paris. Cloth, Sw. frs. 10.40, paper Sw. frs. 7.30. 237 pp. According to the author, this book is a reflection of a series of conferences in which a group of doctors examined in the light of the Bible each of the problems which they have to face: the person, life and death, disease and sin, the meaning and aim of medicine, the gift of healing, relations with the patient, the team spirit, social medicine, love, marriage and celibacy, the laws of health, and so on. It is amply illustrated from the author's own great medical experience.

Change of Heart, by Harold A. Ehrensperger. Friendship Press, New York. Cloth \$2.00, paper \$1.25. 167 pp. This is a story of young people in the India of today, centring around a young Christian named Nihar. It recounts his contacts with Muslims, Buddhists, and the followers of Bhave, who has inherited Gandhi's spiritual mantle, and his conversion to and later disillusionment with communism. When he finally understands the need for a "religion of love" to sustain any reform program, he returns to work in his home village with a new purpose in life.